DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 206 625 SP 018 885

AUTHOR Gollnick, Donna M.
TITLE Multicultural Education in Teacher Education: The State of the Scene.
INSTITUTION American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Washington, D.C.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Feb 78
CONTRACT 400-76-0127
NOTE 177p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC08 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Standards; *Accreditation (Institutions); Bilingual Education; Higher Education; *Institutional Characteristics; *Multicultural Education; *Schools of Education; *Teacher Education Programs
IDENTIFIERS American Association of Colleges for Teacher Educ

ABSTRACT

The National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) Standards for the Accreditation of Teacher Education were revised to include references to multicultural education in May, 1977. To help teacher education institutions plan for and implement the standards, data on existing conditions were collected and analyzed. Information in the areas of curricula, faculty, students, management, and research and development was collected from 387 institutional members of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. Over half of the responding institutions (78.8 percent) indicated that they had, as part of their education programs, activities that are supportive of the multicultural education concept as described in the NCATE Standards. These institutions were more likely to have courses or departments in ethnic and women's studies, to provide inservice training in bilingual and multicultural education, and to have a higher percentage of minority group faculty members. An analysis of institutional characteristics found significant differences based on: (1) public and private institutions; (2) NCATE-accredited and non-accredited institutions; (3) geographic distribution; (4) rural or urban setting; and (5) size of student population. (FG)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED206625

MULTICULTURAL EDUCATION IN TEACHER EDUCATION:

THE STATE OF THE SCENE

Prepared by

Donna M. Gollnick
Assistant Project Director

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

E. Pomeroy

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

Frank H. Klassen, Project Director
Accreditation Standards for Multicultural Teacher Education Project
American Association for Colleges for Teacher Education
One Dupont Circle, Washington, D.C. 20036

February 1978

This report was prepared for the National Institute of Education under Contract #400-76-0127 with the Multicultural/Bilingual Education Division.

SP 018 885

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This report would have been impossible without the assistance of many individuals during the process. For field testing the survey instrument during its development, special acknowledgement is given to Cordell Wynn, Dean of Education at Alabama A & M University; David Washburn, Professor of Education at Bloomsburg State College; and Alan King, Professor of Education at the University of Missouri at St. Louis. Special thanks is given to H. Prentice Baptiste, Director of Multicultural and Bilingual Education Programs at the University of Houston, and Frank Morra, President of Morra Associates, for their reactions to the instrument as it was developed. To members of AACTE's Commission on Multicultural Education--Tomas A. Arciniega, Dean of Education at San Diego State University; Henrietta Whiteman, Director of Native American Studies at the University of Montana; Nancy Arnez, Professor of Education at Howard University; Andrew In, Associate Dean of Education of Nevada at Reno, for their reactions and suggestions to various drafts of the survey instrument. Finally, appreciation for the comments and suggestions of members of the advisory committee for this project, the National Committee for Multicultural Teacher Education Standards--

Richard James, Chairperson
Dean, School of Education
Morgan State University

Tomas Arciniega
Dean, School of Education
San Diego State University

Gwendolyn C. Baker
Director, Affirmative Action
University of Michigan

Andrew In
Associate Dean for Curriculum
University of Hawaii

Bea Medicine
Anthropologist
University of Wisconsin, Madison

Paul Mohr
Dean, College of Education
Florida A & M University

Ann Brannigan
Director, Academic Program Support
University of Vermont

Fred Burke
Commissioner of Education
New Jersey State Dept. of Education

Dolores Cross
Director, Teacher Education
Claremont Graduate School

Joan Duval
Director, Women's Program Staff
U.S. Office of Education

Norma Hernandez
Dean, School of Education
University of Texas, El Paso

Asa Hilliard
Dean, School of Education
San Francisco State University

Anita Pfeiffer
Assistant Professor of Education
University of New Mexico

Maria Ramierez
Director, Bilingual Education
New York State Dept. of Education

Macario Saldate
Coordinator, Bilingual Education
University of Arizona

Rolando Santos
Professor of Education
Calif. State Univ., Los Angeles

Ada Williams
Counselor
Dallas Public Schools

Several persons assisted in steps required for the computerizing the data and final preparation of the document. Special acknowledgement is given to Ralph Cyr, Director of Information Services at AACTE for his technical guidance throughout the project and design of the necessary computer programs. Other individual's whose research assistance made project possible include Sheila Jonas, Tom Sheahan, and Nancy Holland. Thanks is also extended to Roy Shockley who typed and retyped the document as it developed.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Acknowledgements....i

Introduction....1

Statement of the Problem....5
Objectives....7
Methodology....9
Limitations....17
Delimitations....18

Descriptive Profile of Responding Institutions....19

Programs Related to Multicultural Education....20
Faculty....28
Students....32
Research and Development....35
General....41
The Outlook for the Future of Multicultural/Bilingual Education....46

Descriptive Profile of Multicultural Education Provisions in Teacher Education....47

Curricula....48
Faculty for Multicultural/Bilingual Education....56
Students....64
Management of Multicultural/Bilingual Education Programs....65
Differences between Institutions with Provisions for Multicultural Education and Other Institutions....67

Differences between Teacher Education Institutions....77

Public and Private Institutions....78
NCATE Accredited and Non-NCATE Accredited Institutions....90
Geographical Region of Institution....97
Population of City or Area in which Institution Is Located....108
Size of Institution....115

Summary and Recommendations for Further Study....127

Appendices....149

Appendix A: Correspondence Related to "Survey of Multicultural Education in Teacher Education"....149
Appendix B: Survey of Multicultural Education in Teacher Education....156

INTRODUCTION

Beginning in January 1979, colleges and universities applying for accreditation or reaccreditation of their teacher education programs by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) will be expected to show evidence of planning for multicultural education in their curricula. Currently, 536 teacher education institutions are accredited by NCATE; these institutions prepared over 85 percent of the teachers in the United States.

For the first time in its history, the NCATE Standards for the Accreditation of Teacher Education include references to multicultural education. The language of the standards is developed by a standing NCATE committee, the Committee on Standards. In 1976 the language for revised standards was proposed to the NCATE-accredited institutions and the constituent members of the NCATE council including the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE), National Education Association (NEA), Council of Chief State School Officers, National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification (NASDTEC), and National School Board Association (NSBA).[1] Based on the comments of these groups and proposals by AACTE's National Committee on Multicultural Teacher Education Standards, the final language for revised Standards for the Accreditation of Teacher Education included several references to multicultural education. These were adopted by the NCATE Council in May of 1977 to go into effect in January, 1979.

The NCATE standards are divided into two parts: Basic Programs and Advanced Programs. The standards for basic programs are to be applied to

1 The constituent membership of the NCATE Council has been expanded to now also include the Council for Exceptional Children, National Association of School Psychologists, National Council of Teachers of Mathematics, and Student National Education Association.

060 C

all programs beyond the baccalaureate level and beyond the basic programs for the preparation of teachers and other professional school personnel.

The standards for both the basic and advanced programs address six areas of the teacher education program: governance; curricula; faculty; students; resources and facilities; and evaluation, program review, and planning. Each specific standard has a preamble which gives the rationale for the standard, interprets its meaning, and defines terms. According to NCATE, the preamble is to be interpreted as part of the standard which it precedes.[2]

The major reference to multicultural education occurs in the section on curricula for both the basic and advanced programs. Standard 2.1.1. subsumed under "Design of Curricula," is entitled "Multicultural Education." This preamble provides the rationale for the standard and defines multicultural education for the standard:

> 2.1.1. Multicultural Education
>
> Multicultural education is preparation for the social, political, and economic realities that individuals experience in culturally diverse and complex human encounters. These realities have both national and international dimensions. This preparation provides a process by which an individual develops competencies for perceiving, believing, evaluating, and behaving in differential cultural settings. Thus, multicultural education is viewed as an intervention and an on-going assessment process to help institutions and individuals become more responsive to the human condition, individual cultural integrity, and cultural pluralism in society.
>
> Provision should be made for instruction in multicultural education in teacher education programs. Multicultural education should receive attention in courses, seminars, directed readings, laboratory and clinical experiences, practicum, and other types of field experiences.
>
> Multicultural education could include but not be limited to experiences which: (1) Promote analytical and evaluative abilities to confront issues such as participatory democracy, racism and sexism, and the parity of power; (2) Develop skills for values clarification including the study of the manifest and latent transmission of values; (3) Examine the dynamics of diverse cultures and the implications for developing teaching strategies; and (4) Examine linguistic

2"Standards for the Accreditation of Teacher Education, Washington, D.C.; NCATE, 1977,

variations and diverse learning styles as a basis for the development of appropriate teaching strategies.

Standard: The institution gives evidence of planning for multicultural education in its teacher education curricula including both the general and professional studies components.[3]

Other references to multicultural education in the section on curricula for basic programs are made in Standards 2.2 The General Studies Component and 2.4 Use of Guidelines Developed by National Learned Societies and Professional Associations.

The introduction to the standards on faculty for basic programs states that "Teacher education programs require a competent faculty which has systematically developed into a coherent body devoted to the preparation of effective teachers for a multicultural society."[4] The standard for 3.1 Competence and Utilization of Faculty includes the sentence, "Institutional policy will reflect a commitment of multicultural education in the recruitment of full-time faculty members."[5] The preamble for 3.4 Conditions for Faculty Development states that "The plan (for faculty development) includes appropriate opportunities for developing and implementing innovations in multicultural education and for developing new areas of expertise."[6] The preamble to 3.5 Part-Time Faculty also refers to multicultural education in the statement, "The hiring of part-time faculty can provide unique opportunities for the teacher education institution to employ persons from a variety of cultural backgrounds."[7]

The standards related to students in basic programs includes one reference to multicultural education in standard 4.3 Counseling and Advising for Students in Basic Programs. This states that "Qualified counselors and advisers, sensitive to the multicultural character of

3Ibid, p.4
4Ibid, p.7
5Ibid
6Ibid, p.8
7Ibid

society, assist students in assessing their strengths and weaknesses and in planning their programs of study."[8]

The standards for resources and facilities for basic programs includes several references to multicultural education. The introduction states:

> The institution provides an environment which supports the basic teacher program it offers. This environment includes resources and facilities to support the development of an understanding of and appreciation for the culturally diverse nature of American society.[9]

The preamble to Standard 5.1 Library states that "the acquisition policies should reflect a commitment to multicultural education."[10] The preamble to 5.2 Materials and Instructional Media Center includes the following statement:

> ...As a means to assist prospective teachers in developing these understandings and skills, the institution makes available and accessible to students and faculty members appropriate teaching-learning materials and instructional media that reflect cultural diversity in American society.[11]

Finally, the standards related to evaluation, program review, and planning for both the basic and advanced programs include a reference to multicultural education. The preamble to Standard 6.3 Long-Range Planning states that "In addition the long-range plan of the institution reflects a commitment to multicultural education."[12]

References to multicultural education are not as abundant in the standards for advanced programs as those for basic programs. In part, this is due to the greater specificity of advanced programs and the focus on research and analytical skills. The main reference, like the standards for basic programs, occurs in the standards for curricula. G-2.1.1. Multicultural Education is similar in language to 2.1.1

8Ibid, p.9
9Ibid,
10Ibid, p.10
11Ibid
12Ibid, p.11 and 19

previously quoted. The only other reference to multicultural education in the section on curricula is found under Standard G-2.4 Use of Guidelines Developed by National Learned Societies and Professional Associations which states,

> "National learned societies and professional association s with special interest in curricula, including those in multicultural education for the preparation of school personnel, have significant contributions to make to the improvement of advanced programs."13

Multicultural education is referred to in the introduction to the standards on faculty for advanced programs and again in the standard (G-3.4) on conditions for faculty development. The final reference to multicultural education is made in the standard for long-range planning (G-6.3) and reads the same as 6.3 for basic programs.

Thus multicultural education is addressed in the standards for basic programs in the areas of curricula; faculty; students; resources and facilities; and evaluation, program review, and planning. The standards for advanced programs included such references only for curricula; faculty; and evaluation, program review, and planning.[13]

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

As the national organization for teacher education institutions, AACTE was the mechanism through which higher education had reacted to the development of the revised NCATE standards. Reaction to the standards had been solicited through mailings to AACTE's approximately 800 member institutions during 1976 and 1977. As a part of the NIE-sponsored project, "Accreditation Standards for Multicultural Teacher Education," one day conferences were held in San Diego, Chicago, Boston,

13Ibid, p.14

Albuquerque, and Athens, Georgia during January and February, 1977. These conferences brought together administrators from teacher education institutions to discuss the language for the revised standards and to solicit their suggestions and concerns about the nature of proposed changes. During this process, AACTE discovered that institutions had greater concern and questions over the implementation of the multicultural components of the standards than any other proposed changes.

Following the adoption of the revised NCATE standards, AACTE's Board of Directors asked their Commission on Multicultural Education to provide direction for the membership in the development and implementation of the multicultural education components. In addition, the NCATE staff has informally requested assistance in the development of evidence questions that can guide institutions in knowing whether they are meeting the standard. NCATE visiting teams will also need to be oriented to evidences that ought to be requested from an institution to show how they are meeting the multicultural components of various standards.

As a starting point, AACTE's Commission on Multicultural Education decided that it was necessary to obtain data concerning the extent to which multicultural education is currently being addressed by teacher education institutions. Such baseline data would aid the Commission in its task in at least three different ways.

First, an examination of the data would show how great a gap there is between where institutions currently are and where the revised standards suggest they ought to be in the planning and implementation of multicultural education. This information would identify the kinds of curricula and research activities now being undertaken and identified as

multicultural education by the institutions. A determination could also be made concerning factors that contributed to or deterred the development of multicultural education in colleges and universities that have already undertaken such activities. The identification of the gap between where institutions now are and where they are expected to be in 1979 will allow the Commission to better plan activities to assist member institutions in the development and implementation of their own multicultural education programs.

Secondly, the collection of this data would allow a more accurate determination of institutions that are currently implementing programs related to multicultural education. In the past, a few institutions have been identified as having programs. The programs in these institutions and individuals coordinating such programs have been used in meetings conducted by AACTE and the information broadly disseminated. The collection of up-to-date information about on-going programs within the AACTE membership will provide a more accurate representation of multicultural education activity as well as other models that institutions might consider.

Finally, the adoption of these revised standards provides the unique opportunity from which to observe the development and implementation of a concept, multicultural education, into teacher education. The data collected during the fall of 1977 will provide a baseline from which the progress of multicultural education can be measured.

OBJECTIVES

The major objective for collecting data concerning multicultural education in teacher education was to assist teacher education

institutions in the implementation of the multicultural components of the revised NCATE standards. An examination of the standards show that references to multicultural education are made in standards on curricula, faculty, students, resources and long-range planning. Based on these standards, it was determined that the following information for each area was needed:

Curricula

1. What curricula components or modules are being undertaken that have some relationship to multicultural education (e.g., racism, linguistic differences)?

2. What, if any, specific ethnic groups are these courses about at the institution?

3. Are there courses about women specifically offered at the institution?

4. Are there bilingual education courses or programs? In what target languages?

5. Are there inservice programs or courses provided by the education unit?

6. If there are multicultural or bilingual education components within the offerings of the education unit, what are the titles and levels of the courses? How many students are affected by such programs?

7. What provisions are made for multicultural education in the education unit (e.g. component in methodology, separate courses)?

Faculty

1. What is the ethnic and sexual composition of the faculty in the education unit?

2. What types of staff development activities are utilized by faculty members to further their knowledge of multicultural education?

3. If there are provisions for multicultural education within the education unit, what is the ethnic and sexual composition of the faculty members teaching such courses?

4. What are the academic discipline backgrounds of faculty members who teach the components related to multicultural education for the education unit?

5. What types of multicultural education products are produced by the faculty?

6. Does the faculty undertake any research related to multicultural education? If so, what is the nature of that research?

Students

1. What is the ethnic and sexual composition of the student population at the institution? In the education program?

2. In what ethnic situations are the education graduates likely to work?

Resources

1. What types of multicultural education resources (e.g., ethnic heritage center or ethnic community) are utilized by faculty and students?

Long-Range Planning

1. What have been the contributing and deterring factors to the development of multicultural education at the institution?

2. If there are provisions for multicultural education at an institution, how is the program managed? How is it financed?

3. What is the future of the multicultural education at the institution?

General

1. How would the respondent rate the educational desirability of providing experiences in the education program for multicultural education?

2. What services related to multicultural education were desired by the institutions?

METHODOLOGY

To solicit the information that would provide baseline data about the state of the scene for multicultural education in teacher education, a survey instrument was developed. The selection of the population to be surveyed and the development of the instruments will be elaborated in this section.

Population

The general population was limited to higher education institutions which offer basic or advanced programs for education personnel and thus might be initially eligible to apply for accreditation from NCATE. AACTE has a membership of approximately 800 teacher education institutions. All members offer a minimum degree level of bachelors. Because AACTE has a history for surveying its membership concerning teacher education programs, it was appropriate that this survey also utilize the mechanism for conducting such surveys as already exists.

AACTE's membership includes members in all fifty states and Puerto Rico. Institutional members include both private and public institutions that range in student population size from 327 students to 51,000 students. Most of the NCATE-accredited institutions are members of AACTE as well as around 250 institutions that are not accredited. Although only 800 of the approximately 1,200 institutions that prepare teachers are members of AACTE, the AACTE membership is a representative sample of teacher education institutions.

Because of the existing mechanisms for surveying the AACTE membership, it was decided to survey the entire membership of 786 institutions during the fall of 1977. This occurred after the NCATE standards had been adopted in May, 1977, and yet almost one-and-a-half years before the standards were to go into effect.

During July, a letter announcing the fall survey was mailed to the chief institutional representative for each institutional member. The letter (see Appendix A) explained the rationale for the survey of multicultural education in teacher education and requested the cooperation of the

institution in the completion of the survey. For expedience in the handling of the survey at the institutional level, the chief institutional representative was asked to identify a respondent to the survey on a postcard to be returned to AACTE. Almost 700 individuals returned the postcard with a survey respondent identified. When the survey were disseminated in September, they were mailed directly to the individual previously identified as the official institutional respondent.

Instruments

The information that needed to be solicited through this survey was outlined in the section on objectives. Based on those objectives, the survey instrument was first developed by the AACTE staff as a closed questionnaire early in the summer of 1977. This was circulated to members of AACTE's Commission on Multicultural Education and the National Committee for Multicultural Teacher Education Standards for comments and suggestions.

The comments and suggestions of these individuals and other identified experts in the field of surveying and/or multicultural education were incorporated into the next drafts of the instrument. During July and early August, 1977, the survey instrument was field tested at three different sites: Alabama A & M University, Bloomsburg State University, and the University of Missouri at St. Louis. Based on the comments of the field-site respondents, additional changes in format and substance were made to the instrument. Again the instrument was circulated to members of the Commission and National Committee for comments..

By the end of August, the final instrument was developed and ready for dissemination. The instrument included 22 questions in six sections related to specific NCATE standards. The first 21 questions required a check response with space for the addition of an "other" where appropriate. The final question was an open-ended question requiring a written response. The text of the "Survey of Multicultural Education in Teacher Education" can be found in Appendix B.

An outline of each section and question is presented below:

Section A: Programs

1. What specific components or modules related to multicultural education are provided by the education unit? What is the educational desirability for such modules?

2. About which ethnic groups are courses provided at the institution?

3. Are there courses related specifically to women offered at the institution?

4. Does the education unit offer inservice programs in multicultural/bilingual education?

5. Through what means are multicultural/bilingual education addressed in the education unit (e.g., component in foundations course, as a major or minor)?

6. If the education unit has provisions for multicultural/bilingual education, what are the course titles and levels (i.e., undergraduate dual, graduate, or other)?

7. How many students are enrolled in courses or programs related to multicultural education?

Section B: Faculty

8. What is the ethnic and sexual composition of the faculty for the education unit?

9. In what ways has the concept of multicultural/bilingual education been fostered among faculty members in the education unit?

10. If there are provisions for multicultural/bilingual education and some faculty members serve only part of their full-time assignment in the education unit, what discipline or areas of study do those faculty members represent?

11. What disciplines or program areas do full-time education faculty members teaching multicultural/bilingual education components represent?

12. What is the ethnic and sexual composition of the faculty members teaching the multicultural/bilingual education components?

Section C: Management

13. How are the multicultural/bilingual education activities in the education unit developed and managed?

14. How are the multicultural/bilingual education activities and programs financed within the education unit?

15. What resources are utilized by the faculty and students in the implementation of the multicultural/bilingual education programs?

Section D: Students

16. What is the ethnic and sexual composition of the student population at the institution? In undergraduate education? In graduate education?

17. In what ethnic-related situations are the education graduates likely to work?

Section E: Research and Development

18. What types of research activities related to multicultural/bilingual education are undertaken in the education unit? What is the nature of the research? How is such research financially supported?

19. What products related to multicultural/bilingual education are produced by faculty members?

Section F: General

20. What factors have contributed or deterred the development and implementation of multicultural education?

21. What kinds of services related to multicultural education should AACTE provide its membership?

22. What is the outlook for the future of multicultural education in the education unit?

The surveys were mailed with a transmittal letter (Appendix A) and self-addressed, postage-paid return envelope to 786 institutions on September 30, 1977. Respondents were requested to return the survey to AACTE by October 30, 1977. A postcard (Appendix A) was mailed to all

non-respondents during the last week of October to remind them of the pending deadline for the return of the survey instrument. During October and November, calls were made to respondents to follow-up or clarify information that had been provided on the survey instrument.

The initial computer run of the data was conducted during the last week of November with 359 returned cases. A preliminary report of the findings was prepared for "A National Institute on Multicultural Teacher Education Standards," December 14-16, 1977. In January, 1978, twenty-eight addition cases were added to the file and additional analyses were made using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences. Thus, the data for descriptive profiles of the responding institutions as found in this report were collected, analyzed, and presented here.

Statistical Analysis

In addition to examining the frequency distribution for the total population responding to the survey, we chose to investigate the relationship among several variables. Six different null hypotheses were tested and are described in this narrative report. Each of the six null hypotheses included 202 variables which were tested separately for significant differences between respondents. Using demographic data about the institutions that responded to the survey, the following null hypotheses were tested at the .05 level of significance:

1. There will be no difference between institutions with provisions for multicultural/bilingual education and institutions without such provisions on their responses to the questions in the "Survey of Multicultural Education in Teacher Education."

2. There will be no difference between public and private institutions on their responses to the questions in the "Survey of Multicultural Education in Teacher Education."

3. There will be no difference between NCATE-accredited and non-NCATE-accredited institutions on their responses to the questions in the "Survey of Multicultural Education in Teacher Education."

4. There will be no difference in the responses of institutions based on the geographical region of the U.S. in which they are located on their responses to the questions in the "Survey of Multicultural Education in Teacher Education."

5. There will be no difference in the responses of institutions based on the population of the city or area in which they are located on their responses to the questions in the "Survey of Multicultural Education in Teacher Education."

6. There will be no difference in the responses of institutions based on the size of the student population for the institution on their responses to the questions in the "Survey of Multicultural Education in Teacher Education."

The chi square test of the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences[14] was the system of computer programs used for this analysis. The chi square formula used in this package was $\chi^2 = \sum \frac{(f_o^i - f_e^i)^2}{f_e^i}$ where f_o^i equals the observed frequency in each cell, and f_e^i equals the expected frequency calculated as $f_e^r = \frac{c_i r_i}{N}$ where c_i is the frequency in a respective column marginal, r_i is the frequency in a respective row marginal, and N stands for total number of valid cases.

Most questions which supplied nominal data were used for this analysis. This included questions 1-5, 6a, 9, 13-15, 18-21. A total of 202 variables were analyzed for each of the six null hypotheses above.

For the second part of question 1 and for question 20, respondents checked a response along a continuum of five alternatives. Because the frequency of responses in cells at one end of the continuum were often less than five, the responses at the ends of the continuum were collapsed together as one. For both questions, the analysis is based on three responses rather than five. On question 1, the responses analyzed ranged from "desirable" to "neutral" to "not desirable." On question 20, the responses analyzed ranged from "contributing factor" to "no influence" to "deterring factor." Responses

14 Norman H. Nie, et.al., Statistical Package for the Social Sciences, New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Second Edition, 1975.

to all other questions used for this analysis were "yes" or "no".

For this analysis it was determined that a significant difference existed when the level of significance on the chi square test was less than or equal to .05.

Definition of Terms

Several terms are used continuously throughout the survey instrument and this report. These include the following:

1. *Multicultural Education* is an educational concept which values the culturally pluralistic nature of the United States and thus the community and student population that schools serve. It is preparation for the social, political, and economic realities that individuals experience in culturally diverse and complex human encounters. These realities have both national and international dimensions. This preparation provides a process by which an individual develops competencies for perceiving, believing, evaluating, and behaving in differential cultural settings. Thus, multicultural education is viewed as an intervention and on-going assessment process to help institutions and individuals become more responsive to the human condition, individual cultural integrity, and cultural pluralism in society.

2. *Multicultural Teacher Education* provides teachers with the competencies required to teach from a multicultural perspective. It implies that teachers be able to provide programs where all students are helped to understand that being different connotes neither superiority nor inferiority and programs where students of various social and ethnic backgrounds may learn freely from one another.

3. *Bilingual Education* is recognized as an integral part of the multicultural education concept. However, it is distinguished by the dimension of two languages as well as cultural diversity. Bilingual education utilizes both English and the native languages of students in the school program and also provides experiences for learning about the cultural heritage of the non-English speaking ethnic group. These programs may range from transitional programs aimed at having students learning English after several years to a multilingual/multicultural program in which students learn to function totally in two languages and cultures.

4. *Bilingual Teacher Education* provides teachers with the competencies required to teach in schools with bilingual student populations. It also implies that teachers recognize, accept and value the cultural and language differences of students in their instructional and personal communications with students and the community.

5. *Education Unit* is the organizational structure which is responsible for functions related to education as an academic discipline including undergraduate teacher preparation, all departments/divisions/areas within that organizational structure, educational research and professional service. The education unit often takes the form of a professional school, college, or academic division or department.

6. *Institution* is the entire complex of departments, professional schools and other organizational units that are present on the campus.

LIMITATIONS

The descriptive profile presented in this report is based on the data from surveys returned by the 387 teacher education institutions which are members of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE). Although the demographic data about the responding institutions appears to be a representative sample of higher education institutions training teachers, the sample is a self-selecting sample rather than a radomly selected sample of AACTE's institutional members. All of AACTE's 786 institutional members were mailed the survey instrument; 387, 49.2 percent of AACTE's institutional members, returned the survey. This may bias the descriptive profile especially if the non-respondents are more likely than respondents to not have provisions for multicultural education.

The descriptive profile presented here can not be construed as a representative sample of all teacher education programs.

The fact that multicultural education had been the focus of discussions concerning the NCATE standards that were being revised during 1976 and 1977 may have affected the survey responses. Respondents may be more likely to feel that their institution should be doing something in this area than if the survey had been conducted prior to such discussions. Respondents may have been more favorably positive to the incorporation of multicultural education in their teacher education programs as a result.

DELIMITATIONS

This study was limited to teacher education institutions which are members of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. The survey instrument was initially mailed to those 786 institutions that were members of AACTE at that time.

DESCRIPTIVE PROFILE OF RESPONDING INSTITUTIONS

As previously indicated, 786 teacher education institutions were mailed the questionnaire. Responses were received and computerized for 387 cases representing a 49.2 per cent return rate. The institutions returning the survey were representative of AACTE's institutional members as characterized below:

1. 51.4% of the responding institutions were public institutions; 46.6% were private institutions.
2. 17.3% were from the Northeast; 23.3% from the Southeast; 39.5% from the Midwest; 10.3% from the Southwest; and 8.0% from the West.[15]
3. 13.7% of the responding institutions were located in cities with a population of over 500,000; 31.0% in cities with a population between 50,000 and 499,999; 47.8% in cities between 2,500 and 49,999; and 7.2% in towns of less than 2,500.[16]
4. 25% of the responding institutions have a total institutional student population between 327 and 1,366; 25% with 1,367 to 3,609 students; 25% with 3,610 to 9,905 students; and 25% with 9,906 to 50,000 students.[17]
5. 70.5% of the responding institutions were NCATE accredited during 1976-77.[18]

---

15 Northeast includes the states of Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, New York, Pennsylvania, Connecticut, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, New Jersey, Delaware, Maryland, and the District of Columbia. The Southeast includes West Virginia, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Kentucky, Tennessee, Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, and Arkansas. The Midwest includes Ohio, Indiana, Michigan, Minnesota, Wisconsin, Illinois, Missouri, Iowa, North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, and Kansas. The Southwest includes Oklahoma, Texas, New Mexico, Colorado, Utah, and Arizona. The West includes Wyoming, Montana, Idaho, Washington, Oregon, Nevada, California, Alaska and Hawaii.

16 The population size of the cities in which institutions are located was based on 1970 U.S. Census figures.

17 The student population of an institution was based on the figures for full and part-time students as listed in the Education Directory: Colleges and Universities--1976-77 by the NCES.

18 The status of the institution's NCATE accreditation was taken from NCATE's 23rd Annual List: 1976-77.

The data presented in this section of the paper represents only the 387 institutions that returned the survey instrument. At this point, no attempt has been made to discover the make-up of the non-respondents; thus the data presented may be biased and should not be interpreted as representative of the total American teacher education community.

This descriptive profile of the responding teacher education institutions is presented in five sections: (1) programs related to multicultural education; (2) faculty; (3) students; (4) research and development activities related to multicultural education; and (5) other factors affecting multicultural education programs.

PROGRAMS RELATED TO MULTICULTURAL EDUCATION

Respondents were asked to identify whether their education unit had provisions for fifteen different activities. The following indicates the fifteen different activities and the percentage of responding institutions that indicated that they have such provisions within their education program:

1.	Study of intergroup communications and classroom dynamics	82.2%
2.	A student teaching experience in a school with students who are racially/ethnically different from the student teachers	77.5
3.	Experiences which prepare education personnel to work more effectively with minority students	73.9
4.	Study of values clarification	73.1
5.	Study of the dynamics of diverse cultures and the implications for developing appropriate teaching strategies	71.2
6.	Study of cultures and ethnicity of those groups within the geographical region served by the education unit	57.6
7.	Study of diverse learning styles related to ethnic/cultural difference and the implications for developing appropriate teaching strategies	55.6
8.	Experiences which prepare education personnel to teach content from a multicultural perspective	51.9
9.	Study of racism	51.7

10.	Study of sexism	49.9%
11.	Study of socioeconomics	46.5
12.	Study of specific ethnic groups within the U.S. (i.e., Afro American Studies, Mexican American Studies)	45.0
13.	Study of linguistic variations and the implications for developing appropriate teaching strategies	43.4
14.	Study of cultural competencies that can be transferred from one cultural or multicultural setting to another	37.7
15.	Study of foreign cultures	35.7

Respondents were also asked to assess the educational desirability for the fifteen activities listed above on a scale from "highly desirable" to "not desirable." The following shows the responses for this question:

		Highly Desirable (1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	Not Desirable (5)
1.	Study of intergroup communications and classroom dynamics	57.1%	24.8%	7.8%	.5%	.3%
2.	Experiences which prepare educational personnel to work more effectively with minority students	56.6	25.8	7.2	.8	.3
3.	A student teaching experience in school with students who are racially/ethnically different from the student teachers	51.4	25.3	15.8	.5	.5
4.	Study of the dynamics of diverse cultures and the implications for developing appropriate teaching strategies	49.6	28.2	12.1	2.1	8.0
5.	Experiences which prepare education personnel to teach content from a multicultural perspective	48.3	25.8	12.1	3.1	0
6.	Study of cultures and ethnicity of those groups within the geographical region served by the education unit	47.0	27.4	13.7	2.1	9.8

7.	Study of values clarification	46.0%	31.5%	12.4%	1.0%	.8%
8.	Study of diverse learning styles related to ethnic/cultural differences and the implications for developing appropriate teaching strategies	40.6	31.8	15.2	1.8	.3
9.	Study of racism	39.3	28.7	15.5	3.6	2.6
10.	Study of sexism	36.4	25.3	19.1	4.7	3.4
11.	Study of linguistic variations and the implications for developing appropriate teaching strategies	34.9	18.1	19.9	5.7	1.0
12.	Study of cultural competencies that can be transferred from one cultural or multicultural setting to another	33.6	24.8	26.1	2.1	.8
13.	Study of specific ethnic groups within the U.S.	34.1	25.3	23.0	3.1	1.6
14.	Study of socioeconomics	27.4	35.4	20.4	2.8	.8
15.	Study of foreign cultures	22.0	28.4	28.4	6.5	2.3

If the two responses at the "highly desirable" end of the continuum are examined together, over half of the respondents felt that all of the fifteen activities listed are educationally desirable. The activities presently being provided by education units are, for the most part, in a similar position to the respondents' rating of educational desirability for the activity. The percentage of respondents who indicated that the activity is educationally desirable is higher for all activities than the percentage of institutions actually including the activity in their programs.

Ethnic Studies

139 institutions, 35.9 percent of the responding institutions, have departments or divisions related to a specific U.S. ethnic group.

295 institutions, 76.2 percent of the responding institutions, offer courses related to specific U.S. ethnic groups. These courses and departments are often not located within the education unit itself, but offered by other divisions, departments, schools or colleges in the institution. The following indicates the percentage of responding institutions with departments/divisions and courses related to specific ethnic groups:

Ethnic Group	Department	Courses
Afro Americans	20.7 %	58.1%
Mexican Americans	9.8	18.4
American Indians	7.8	31.0
Puerto Ricans	4.2	6.8
Asian Americans	2.6	12.2
French Americans	2.3	4.1
Jewish Americans	2.3	6.2
Russian Americans	2.3	3.6
Japanese Americans	1.8	5.2
Portuguese Americans	1.6	2.6
Chinese Americans	1.6	7.8
Italian Americans	1.3	5.5
Polish Americans	.8	3.4
Greek Americans	.8	2.1
Appalachians	.6	4.4
Irish Americans	.5	2.6
Eskimos	.3	1.6
Filipino Americans	.3	2.6
Others	8.5	12.6

The ethnic groups specified by respondents as "other" varied from a composite of several groups listed above to a different description of the groups above to a group not listed on the survey. The "others" are presented here in four groups" (1) Specific U.S. Ethnic/Cultural Groups, (2) Composite of Several U.S. Ethnic/Cultural Groups, (3) Foreign Cultures or International Focus, and (4) Other Emphases.

Specific U.S. Ethnic/Cultural Groups	Frequency of Responses
Hispanic Americans	6
Women's Studies	5
Black Studies	5
Cuban Americans	3
Korean Americans	2
Amish	1
Armenian Americans	1
Dutch Americans	1
Lithuanian Americans	1
Samoan Americans	1
Composite of Several U.S. Ethnic/ Cultural Groups	
Multiethnic/Multicultural	14
Minority Groups	10
Regional Ethnic Groups	1
School of Intercultural Studies	1
Foreign Cultures or International Focus	
Latin American Studies	4
German Culture & Civilization	3
African Studies	2
Arabs	2
Pacific Cultures	2
Asian Studies	1
Caribbean Studies	1
Chaldean	1
Ethnic Studies in British Education	1
International Education	1
International Student Office	1
Muslim	1
Southeast Asia	1
Sub-Saharan African Cultures	1
Third World Seminar	1
Vietnamese	1
Other Emphases	
Human Relations	4
Black Dialect	1
Education of the Disadvantaged	1
Ethnic Diversity in Education	1
Latin Americans in Metropolitan Centers	1
Race Relations	1
The Urban Experience	1

22.5 percent of the responding institutions require at least one course related to ethnic groups for completion of a degree program in education. 7.8 percent have the same requirement for completion of non-degree programs in education.

Women's Studies

53 institutions, 13.7 percent of the responding institutions, have a department or division at the college or university related to women's studies. At 225 of the institutions, 58.1 percent of the responding institutions, courses in women's studies are offered. Nine percent or 35 of the institutions require students to take at least one course in women's studies to complete the[illegible]quirements for a degree program in education. Eight, 2.1 percent, require such coursework to complete requirements for a non-degree program in education.

Inservice Programs

150 institutions, 38.8 percent of those responding to the survey, offer inservice programs in multicultural/bilingual-bicultural education either as an independent unit or in cooperation with a local education agency, teacher center, or other agency. The types of inservice programs provided include workshops, seminars, conferences, consultative resource center, and field experiences. These are sometimes offered at the college or university as part of their regular undergraduate or graduate offerings. The education unit most often offers inservice programs in cooperation with a local education agency; the location of these programs is usually in the local school district rather than at the college or university. Inservice programs are also offered by the

education unit in cooperation with teacher centers and continuing education centers. Teacher Corps programs were listed as providing such inservice programs in at least three cases.

The majority of these inservice programs are provided for teachers in local education agencies. Some of the programs are for administrators and others for paraprofessionals at the local school level. In a few instances the programs were developed as staff development activities for other faculty members in the education unit. One institution provides inservice programs for recently naturalized citizens with teaching certificates from their mother countries.

The ethnic/cultural/linguistic focus of the inservice programs also varies widely. Bilingual education is often addressed through inservice programs to assist educators in teaching limited-English speaking students or to provide the course work for certification in bilingual education. Many of the inservice programs have a multicultural focus. These address issues of cultural awareness, human relations, and racism and sexism as well as several specific ethnic groups. The major ethnic groups included in these programs are Afro Americans, Mexican Americans, other Spanish-speaking Americans, American Indians, and Asian Americans. Other ethnic groups mentioned by at least one institution as the focus of inservice programs were Italian Americans, Appalachians, Greek Americans, Arab Americans, and Vietnamese. The language groups which were included as a part of the bilingual education focus included Spanish, several American Indian languages, Portuguese, Italian, and French. Two institutions listed comparative and international education as the focus. Non-standard English and low socio-economic status were also listed as emphases in inservice education programs.

Provisions for Multicultural/Bilingual Education

305 of the 387 responding institutions (78.8%) have some provisions for multicultural or bilingual education programs in their education unit. These provisions are most often found as components in foundations or methodology courses. 198 institutions (51.2% of the responding institutions) have courses or offer a major or minor in multicultural or bilingual education. The following shows the percentage of all responding institutions with provisions for multicultural and bilingual education plus the percentage of institutions with multicultural and/or bilingual education:

Provision	Total MCE and/ or BCE	Multicultural Education	Bilingual Education
Component in Foundations Course(s)	58.9%	72.4%	37.8%
Component in Methodology Course(s)	49.4	58.4	37.5
Major Emphasis in Course(s)	23.5	25.0	18.6
Major or Specialization Offered	18.6	25.0	18.6
Minor or Supplementary Offered	18.1	15.0	17.8
Department/Division	10.1	9.0	10.3
Other	14.0	13.6	8.4

The "others" specified by respondents included courses or workshops in human relations, communications skills, cultural awareness, migrant students, and Latin America. Field experiences were listed by eleven of the respondents. Two programs were also listed - the C.U.T.E. and Title VII Bilingual Education.

FACULTY

347 (89.7% of the responding institutions) completed the question about the ethnic and sexual make-up of the faculty for the education unit at the institution. The chart that follows indicates the percentage of the 347 institutions responding to this question with faculty members from different ethnic and sexual backgrounds. The range of faculty members from each ethnic group is also shown. Full-time faculty includes persons carrying a full-time load, all of whose activities are devoted to operations of the education unit. Split-time faculty includes full-time faculty for whom only a portion of their activities are devoted to activities operated by the education unit (e.g., an English professor who teaches one methods course). Part-time faculty includes persons carrying less than a full-time load in the education unit who are not full-time employees of the institution.

	FULL-TIME		SPLIT-TIME		PART-TIME	
	%	Range	%	Range	%	Range
White American Male	87.9	1-160	44.7	1-43	43.5	1-105
White American Female	86.7	1-76	38.6	1-19	50.1	1-46
Black American Male	28.0	1-69	8.6	1-15	7.5	1-4
Black American Female	27.7	1-68	5.2	1-18	7.2	1-4
Hispanic American Male	15.6	1-10	4.6	1-4	3.5	1-6
Hispanic American Female	11.5	1-10	3.5	1-4	4.0	1-4
Asian American Male	11.0	1-21	2.3	1-1	1.2	1-2
Asian American Female	6.9	1-17	1.2	1-2	2.3	1-3
American Indian or Eskimo Male	6.1	1-2	1.2	1-1	.9	1-1
American Indian or Eskimo Female	2.0	1-6	.9	1-1	.9	1-3
Other Male	6.1	1-4	.9	1-2	.9	1-3
Other Female	1.4	1-1	.3	2-2	.6	1-1

As expected, the white male and female are faculty members in the overwhelming majority of teacher education institutions. Blacks appear to be the most likely minority group with faculty positions although less than one-third of the institutions have any full-time black faculty members. The faculty of historically black institutions is also predominantly black. Less than 16 percent of the institutions report Hispanics as full-time faculty members. Less than seven percent of the institutions have Asian faculty members. The maximum ranges of 21 and 17 for full-time Asian faculty is due to the reports from Hawaiian universities where Asian Americans are more likely to be faculty members. The least represented American minority group is American Indians. Less than seven percent of the institutions have American Indian or Eskimo male faculty, and only two percent have American Indian or Eskimo female faculty.

Approximately one-half of the institutions indicated split-time or part-time faculty members in the education unit. Again the majority of these institutions have white faculty members with the proportion of minority faculty even less than for full-time faculty.

The following chart shows the percentage of the total faculty population from various ethnic and sexual backgrounds at each level of employment:

	Full-Time	Split-Time	Part-Time
Number of Responding Institutions	347	190	223
White American Male	61.90%	61.38%	46.39%
White American Female	27.88	27.64	43.57
Black American Male	3.84	3.45	2.38
Black American Female	3.10	2.98	2.27
Hispanic American Male	.97	1.49	2.00
Hispanic American Female	.77	1.49	1.14
Asian American Male	.79	.74	.38
Asian American Female	.40	.34	1.30
American Indian or Eskimo,Male	.23	.27	.16
American Indian or Eskimo Female	.12	.20	.38

The ethnic/racial composition of full-time teacher education faculties is not representative of the U.S. population. Using 77 U.S. Census figures, the following comparison of the pluralistic nature of teacher education faculties and the general population can be made:

	Teacher Education	U.S. Population
White Americans	89.78%	82.40%*
Black Americans	6.94	11.00*
Hispanic Americans	1.74	5.10*
Asian Americans	1.19	.80+
American Indian/Eskimos	.35	.40+

The percentage of women who are full-time faculty members is 32.27 compared to 67.73 percent male. The breakdown at the split-time level is 32.65 percent women and 67.35 percent men. The percentage of women teaching as part-time faculty members increases considerably over this level where 48.66 percent of the part-time faculty is female.

There are also differences between the percentage of women within each ethnic/racial group as shown in the following chart:

	Full-Time	Split-Time	Part-Time
White American	31.1%	30.9%	48.2%
Black American	45.5	36.5	49.0
Hispanic American	45.0	49.1	40.2
Asian American	33.1	31.7	66.7
American Indian or Eskimo	36.5	42.9	69.7

Except for Hispanic females, the percentage of females working as part-time faculty increased over the other levels. The greatest discrepancy between the number of male and female faculty members occurs in the White American group.

*1977 U.S. Census Figures
+1970 U.S. Census Figures

Faculty Development Activities

The concept of multicultural/bilingual education has been fostered among faculty members in the education unit through various activities. The following shows the percentage of responding institutions (387) that indicate the specific activity as means by which faculty learn about multicultural and bilingual education:

Activity	Total	Multicultural Education	Bilingual Education
Professional Association Meetings	53.0%	48.6%	27.4%
Faculty is on their own with respect to multi-cultural/bilingual education	48.3	44.7	28.4
Seminars/symposiums	35.4	30.7	17.6
Cross-cultural field experiences	33.9	29.7	15.5
Inservice training for faculty	19.4	17.6	8.0
Faculty research grants for multicultural/ bilingual education projects	17.1	12.4	9.9
Sabbatical(s) for projects related to multicultural/ bilingual education	13.4	9.5	7.5
Other	6.2	4.7	3.2

The "others" specified by several of the respondents included the use of consultants who are not members of the education unit and projects within the institution unit that have a multicultural focus. Also mentioned was faculty participation in university and community activities, federal and state projects, travel, prior teaching and urban experience in multicultural settings, contracts with foreign governments, language classes, and professional periodicals.

STUDENTS

The question about the ethnic and sexual backgrounds of students for the total institution, undergraduate education, and graduate education had the lowest frequency of responses. Using the data provided by those institutions that supplied the figures for their student population as well as the latest available figures from USOE's Office of Civil Rights, figures for the total institution enrollment were compiled for a total of 385 institutions, 99.5 percent of all institutions responding to the survey. The following chart shows the percentage of institutions with students from different ethnic and sexual backgrounds and the numerical range of students at the institutions. The percentages are based on the 385 institutions for which student populations figures for the total institution were available.

	Total Institution		Undergraduate Education		Graduate Education	
Responding Institutions	n=385		n=186		n=91	
	%	Range	%	Range	%	Range
White American Male	97.7	2-21,590	90.3	1-9,870	92.3	1-4,346
White American Female	99.2	5-22,454	90.9	1-7,508	91.2	1-2,564
Black American Male	95.1	1-3,718	78.0	1-1,722	80.2	1-547
Black American Female	96.4	1-3,896	81.7	1-1,908	75.8	1-162
Hispanic American Male	76.6	1-2,400	44.1	1-238	53.8	1-81
Hispanic American Female	77.1	1-2,880	52.2	1-419	52.7	1-89
Asian American Male	71.2	1-1,350	32.8	1-230	38.5	1-45
Asian American Female	75.8	1-1,141	43.5	1-504	49.5	1-38
American Indian/Eskimo Male	62.1	1-239	29.0	1-53	29.7	1-22
American Indian/Eskimo Female	60.3	1-232	30.1	1-300	33.0	1-26
Other Male	26.8	1-4,884	21.5	1-212	34.1	1-457
Other Female	26.0	1-4,649	25.8	1-351	34.1	1-581

Over 96 percent of the responding institutions have a student population at their institution that includes some minority students. Both white and black students are enrolled in over 95 percent of the institutions. Hispanic and Asian students are enrolled in 71.2-77.1 percent of the institutions while American Indian or Eskimo students are enrolled in less than 62.1 percent. There was no clarification of "others" on this question. Sometimes this included white ethnic groups, sometimes foreign students, but was usually not specified.

Only 186 of the respondents provided enrollment figures for undergraduate education and only 91 for graduate education. Based on the limited responses to these two sections of the question, it appears that minority enrollments in education is less than the minority enrollment of the total student population. The percentage of institutions reporting minority education students at both undergraduate and graduate levels is less than those reporting minority enrollment for the total institution.

The percent of the student populations from various ethnic and sexual backgrounds is shown for the same three categories below:

	Total Institution	Undergraduate Education	Graduate Education
White American Male	46.91%	36.08%	39.11%
White American Female	41.53	51.64	51.24
Black American Male	3.49	4.30	2.77
Black American Female	4.16	4.33	3.62
Hispanic American Male	1.22	.82	.89
Hispanic American Female	1.15	1.20	1.07
Asian American Male	.56	.34	.38
Asian American Female	.49	.53	.47
American Indian/Eskimo Male	.25	.20	.22
American Indian/Eskimo Female	.24	.56	.22

The institutions responding to this survey do not have student populations that are representative of the ethnic/racial composition of the U.S. population. The percentages of student populations and the U.S. population follow:

	Total Institution	Undergraduate Education	Graduate Education	U.S. Population
White Americans	88.44%	87.72%	90.35%	82.40%*
Black Americans	7.65	8.63	6.39	11.00*
Hispanic Americans	2.37	2.02	1.96	5.10*
Asian Americans	1.05	.87	.85	.80+
American Indian/Eskimos	.49	.76	.44	.40+

The percentage of minority students in undergraduate education is slightly higher for Black and American Indian and Eskimo students than their enrollment at the total institutional level. The percent of undergraduate education students who are White, Hispanic or Asian Americans is slightly less than the percent enrolled in the institution. The percent of all minority graduate education students is less than that at any other level.

47.57 percent of the institutions' student population is female. The number of females who are enrolled in undergraduate education programs, however, is 58.26 percent of the undergraduate education students. There are also more women as graduate education students than men. 56.62 percent of the reported graduate education students are female.

*1977 U.S. Census figures

+1970 U.S. Census figures

Employment of Teacher Education Graduates

Institutions with data about the employment of teacher education graduates were asked to indicate the percentage of those graduates working in situations where the student population is likely to be other than majority white. 75 institutions reported that from 1-100 percent of their graduates are employed in inner-city schools. 39 institutions indicated that 1-95 percent of their graduates work in bilingual classrooms/schools. 32 institutions reported that from 1-50 percent of their graduates work on American Indian Reservations. Another 39 institutions indicated that from 2-100 percent of their graduates worked in other situations. These "other" included 26 institutions which listed rural or small towns as the situation in which their graduates worked; 16 respondents listed suburban areas; three listed Appalachia; and three listed overseas.

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

Survey respondents were asked to indicate the types of research activities undertaken in the education unit, the nature of these research activities, the financial support for activities, and the types of products produced by members of the education unit. Respondents were to indicate only the research and development activities for multicultural and/or bilingual education.

Type of Research Activities

139 institutions (35.9% of those responding to the survey) reported that there is some type of research in the area of multicultural and/or bilingual education occurring within their education unit. The following chart shows the type of research being pursued in these areas by frequency of responses and percentage of the 387 institutions responding to the survey.

Type of Research	Multicultural		Bilingual	
	n	%	n	%
Faculty Projects	75	19.4	48	12.4
Master Theses	45	11.7	33	8.6
Sponsored Research	40	10.3	24	6.2
Doctoral Dissertations	31	8.0	28	7.2
Special Institutes	29	7.5	22	5.7
Other	19	4.9	9	2.3

The "other" specified by the respondents included workshops, seminars, practicum, and conferencies. Also mentioned were consultancies and visiting scholars.

Nature of the Research

112 institutions (28.9% of those responding to the survey) responded to this question in the area of multicultural education; 71 (18.3%) responded in the area of bilingual education. The following research topics are being investigated (percentages are based on the number of institutions that responded to this question):

Nature of Research	Multicultural		Bilingual	
	n	%	n	%
Research of Instructional Processes	78	69.6%	66	93.0%
Research on Social/ Cultural Processes	75	67.0	51	71.8
Research on Interethnic Attitudes	62	55.4	35	49.3
Research on Acculturation/ Assimilation/Cultural Pluralism	58	51.8	39	54.9
Ethnographic Research	49	43.8	27	38.0
Research on Culturally-Biased Tests and Other Measurement Instruments Influenced by Cultural Differences	37	33.0	33	46.5
Other	21	18.8	15	21.1

"Others" specified by respondents included the following research topics:

1. Bilingual/multicultural schools in Latin America;
2. State-of-the-art studies of multicultural education and ethnic studies;
3. Preparation of teachers for urban settings;
4. Multicultural education in Title VII projects;
5. Linguistics and language research;
6. Filming of public school programs;
7. Resources on specific Midwest religious, racial and ethnic groups;
8. Development of curriculum materials;
9. Language characteristics of ethnic groups and achievement in reading;
10. Demographic studies;

11. Multiethnic instructional media;

12. Culturally different gifted students;

13. Legal research; and

14. Community involvement in bilingual education.

Respondents also indicated on this question whether the research was undertaken by graduate students or faculty members. With one exception, a greater number of institutions reported faculty undertaking these research topics than graduate students. The only exception was "research of instructional processes" for bilingual education where the research is more often undertaken by graduate students than by faculty members. Often the research topics are being investigated both by faculty members and graduate students at the same institution. The following chart outlines the level at which different research topics are being undertaken:(percentages are based on the 387 responding institutions):

	Multicultural				Bilingual			
	Faculty		Grad Student		Faculty		Grad Student	
Nature of Research	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Research of Instructional Processes	47	12.2	31	8.1	30	7.8	36	9.3
Research on Social/Cultural Processes	47	12.2	28	7.2	29	7.5	22	5.7
Research on Interethnic Attitudes	38	9.9	24	6.2	17	4.4	18	4.6
Research on Acculturation/ Assimilation/ Cultural Pluralism	37	9.5	21	5.4	23	6.0	16	4.2
Ethnographic Research	31	8.1	18	4.7	15	3.9	12	3.1

	Multicultural				Bilingual			
	Faculty		Grad Student		Faculty		Grad Student	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Research on Culturally-Biased Tests & Other Measurement Instruments Influences by Cultural Differences	23	5.9	14	3.6	21	5.4	12	3.1
Other	12	3.1	9	2.4	8	2.0	7	1.8

Support for Research Activities

123 institutions responded to this question; 103 for multicultural education and 70 for bilingual education. The major support for research activities for both multicultural and bilingual education comes from the institution itself as indicated below. The following indicates the frequency of responses and the percentage of the institutions responding to each section of this question that reported the listed support:

	Multicultural (103)		Bilingual (70)	
Support	n	%	n	%
College or University	72	69.9	49	70
U.S. Office of Education	25	24.3	25	35.7
Private Foundations	12	11.7	3	4.3
State Education Agencies	12	11.7	6	8.6
Local Education Agencies	4	3.9	2	2.9
National Institute of Education	5	4.9	2	2.9
Other	23	22.3	14	20

Other sources of support for multicultural and bilingual education research efforts included personal funds of students or faculty, professional associations, foreign governments, state government grants, and textbook companies.

Products

Respondents were asked to identify the types of products related to multicultural and/or bilingual education produced by members of their education unit. 140 institutions (36.2% of institutions responding to survey) indicated that there were products produced in multicultural education, and 88 institutions (22.7%) indicated that products were produced in bilingual education. The specific type of products produced in each area are listed below. Both the frequency of responses and percentage of the 387 survey respondents are shown.

Type of Product	Multicultural		Bilingual	
	n	%	n	%
Presentations as practitioner-oriented meetings	99	25.6	65	16.2
Educational products for local or regional dissemination	56	14.4	41	10.6
Publications in practitioner-oriented journals (e.g., Today's Education, Phi Delta Kappan)	46	11.9	26	6.7
Publications in books	56	14.4	41	10.6
Presentations at research-oriented meetings	42	10.4	26	6.7
Educational products for national dissemination	31	8.0	29	7.5
Publications in research-oriented journals (e.g., American Educational Research Journal)	23	6.0	17	4.4
Other	15	3.9	11	2.9

Other types of products specified by respondents included modules for classroom use, federal and state project reports, seminar papers, audio-visual tapes, slides, bibliographies, and graduate theses and dissertations.

GENERAL

Respondents were asked to indicate factors that either contributed to or deterred the planning, development, and implementation of multicultural/bilingual education programs in their education unit. In addition, they identified the kinds of services that they would like AACTE to provide to institutions to assist them in planning, developing, and implementing multicultural education programs. Finally, respondents were asked to write what they considered the future of multicultural and/or bilingual education to be at their institution.

Contributing Factors to Development

346 institutions (89% of the survey respondents) responded to this question on the survey. Respondents marked that the specific factor either was a "major contribution," of "no influence," or a "major deterrent" to the planning, development, and implementation of multicultural/bilingual education. The following chart presents the responses to the factors indicated on the survey as contributing or deterring the the development of multicultural/bilingual teacher education programs. The percentages shown are based on the 387 institutions that responded to the survey.

Factor	Major Contribution	(2)	No Influence	(4)	Major Deterrent
University/College Administration	14.5%	24.5%	29.7%	3.9%	1.8%
Various Ethnic Groups	11.4	25.3	32.6	2.6	1.6
State Education Agency Guidelines and/or Regulations	14.5	21.7	27.9	4.9	2.6
Encouragement of Professional Associations	10.6	25.1	33.9	2.6	.5
Faculty Qualified to Teach Multi-cultural/Bilingual Education	19.4	17.1	12.9	19.6	12.1
State Legislation Related to Multi-cultural/Bilingual Education	14.0	15.8	33.9	5.4	2.1
Federal Legislation Related to Multi-cultural/Bilingual Education	11.9	15.5	38.8	3.1	.8
Availability of Federal Funds	10.9	8.0	29.5	11.9	13.2
Desegregation of School District Near the University/College	10.1	12.9	44.7	1.0	1.0
Availability of Curri-culum Materials for College Students	5.7	17.8	18.3	16.0	5.2
Teacher Organizations	5.4	14.7	47.5	2.3	.8
Availability of State Funds	6.5	7.0	28.7	14.7	14.7
Availability of University Funds	8.0	7.2	12.0	20.7	20.2
Other	5.4	0.0	.5	.5	3.1

To analyze the major contributing factors and deterring factors, responses of (1) and (2) were combined as contributing factors and (4) and (5) as deterring factors, Several of the factors appeared concentrated at both ends of the continuum indicating that they were major contributions for some institutions yet the factors that deterred development of multicultural/bilingual education for others. As an example, "Faculty Qualified to Teach Multicultural/Bilingual Education" was a contributing factor for 36.5 percent of the institutions. At the same time, qualified faculty was a deterrent for 31.7 percent of the institutions. The availability of federal funds was another factor for which institutions responded at both ends of the continuum: 18.9 percent indicated that this was a contributing factor while 25.1 percent reported it as a deterring factor. The availability of curriculum materials for college students also provoked responses at both ends of the continuum. 23.5 percent reported it as contributing and 21.2 percent at a deterrent.

Factors which were considered as contributors to the planning, development and implementation of multicultural/bilingual education by at least 25 percent of the institutions included:

University/College Administration	39%
Various Ethnic Groups	36.7%
State Education Agency Guidelines/Regulations	36.2%
Encouragement of Professional Associations	35.7%
State Legislation	29.8%
Federal Legislation	27.4%

331 institutions (85.5%) responded to this question. The types of services that institutions would like AACTE to provide in the area of multicultural/bilingual education are shown below. The percentages are based on the 387 institutions that responded to the survey.

AACTE Services

Publish a journal or bulletin that informs teacher educators of new ideas, approaches, or materials in multicultural education	58.4%
Facilitate the dissemination of information about operationally and programmatically successful multicultural education programs.	56.3
Provide a clearinghouse for informational, research and analytical studies of multicultural education	50.6
Catalogue information about funding agencies to disseminate as a directory	44.4
Provide information about federal and state legislation	43.7
Convene national or regional meetings on multicultural education	38.5
Maintain a consultative service on multicultural teacher education that can match expertise to needs at all levels	37.2
Stimulate research and analysis on various aspects of multicultural education through the convening of task force.	33.3
Provide consultation on development of proposals and research designs for submission to federal agencies	32.8
Conduct research and analytical studies on multicultural education.	27.9
Other	6.2

Others listed by the respondents were to encourage scholarly writings in this area, provide information about employment opportunities in non-teaching situations, organize inservice faculty workshops/ institutes, lobby for state monies, develop assessment tool for affective objectives of multicultural education, develop modular and/or

audio-visual materials, and assist state associations in helping individual institutions. Other comments includes eliminating multicultural education as a requirement for certification, mandating multicultural education for continuing certification, dropping this area and concentrating on the more critical survival concerns of teacher education (i.e., finance, enrollments, control, accreditation), and "helping ethnic groups to establish some kind of generalized identity so the non-member can more nearly present them as a positive, contributing group."

Two factors were considered deterrent to the planning, development, and implementation of multicultural/bilingual education by at least 25 percent of the institutions:

Availability of University Funds	40.9%
Availability of State Funds	29.4%

Desegregation of school districts near the university/college and teacher organizations have little influence on multicultural/bilingual education at most institutions. The influence that these two factors have is toward contributing rather than deterring.

Other factors listed by respondents as contributing factors included the NCATE Standards, human relations requirements, interested faculty members, the interest of local teachers, committed faculty members, student interest, Teacher Corps, the Title IV Project, and community need. Deterring factors listed were lack of interest and felt need, faculty workload, indecision at the state level, homogeneity of student teaching sites, lack of demand from students, lack of ethnic groups in the community, negative attitudes of faculty, degree program requirements, no substantive knowledge base, limited curriculum resources in various disciplines, and lack of philosophical acceptance.

THE OUTLOOK FOR THE FUTURE OF MULTICULTURAL/BILINGUAL EDUCATION

The final question on the survey was open-ended. It asked the respondent to indicate the future of multicultural and/or bilingual education in his/her education unit. Responses fell into three general categories. Roughly half of the respondents were somewhat ambivalent about the future. The future at those institutions is likely to depend on the availability of federal funds, faculty interest, state and federal requirements, and student interest. Without financial support equal to or beyond what is now available, muticultural/bilingual education will not continue or be developed. The second group of approximately twenty percent had a complete lack of interest in multicultural/bilingual education. The third group of approximately thirty percent recognized a need for cultural pluralism in the teacher education programs as both an immediate and long-term goal. This group is comprised of those institutions that are either continuing already established programs or are developing program now. These institutions are also dependent on financial support and feel a "crunch" when the support diminishes.

DESCRIPTIVE PROFILE OF MULTICULTURAL EDUCATION PROVISIONS IN TEACHER EDUCATION

The fifth question on the survey asked the respondent to indicate how multicultural and bilingual education was being addressed within the education unit during the fall, 1977 session. The education units in 305 institutions address multicultural and/or bilingual education as components in foundations and/or methodology courses, as a major emphasis in courses, as a major or minor as a department/division and/or through other means of percentage of responding institutions with such provisions is repeated below:

Provision	Total MCE and/ or BCE	Multicultural Education	Bilingual Education
Component in Foundations Course(s)	58.9%	72.4%	37.8%
Component in Methodology	49.4	58.4	37.5
Major Emphasis in Course(s)	23.5	25.0	18.6
Major or Specialization Offered	18.6	25.0	18.6
Minor or Supplementary Offered	18.1	15.0	17.8
Department/Division	10.1	9.0	10.3
Other	14.0	13.6	8.4

198 institutions have courses or offer a major or minor in multicultural and/or bilingual education. 110 institutions provide for Multicultural and/or Bilingual Education through components in foundations and/or methodology courses only. These institutions are listed in AACTE's

Directory of Multicultural Education Programs in U.S. Teacher Education Institutions.

In this section the multicultural and bilingual programs of these 305 teacher education institutions will be described. This section is subdivided into six parts: curricula, faculty, students, research and development, management, and general differences between institutions with provisions for multicultural and/or Bilingual Education and other institutions.

CURRICULA

79.7 percent of the institutions with provisions for multicultural and/or bilingual education have courses and sometimes departments or divisions related to specific ethnic groups. 23.9 percent of these institutions require that education majors complete one or more courses related to specific groups. 8.9 % percent require students to complete such courses certain non-degree programs. The specific ethnic groups which these courses addressed are outlined in the section, "Descriptive Profile of Responding Institutions."

63 percent of these institutions also offer courses related to women's studies. 14.8 percent have departments or divisions withing the institutions whose major focus is women's studies. 9.5% of these institutions require completion of at least one course in women's studies to complete an education degree program. Courses in women's studies are required for the completion of certain non-degree programs by 2.3 percent.

Inservice programs in multicultural and/or bilingual education are offered by 43.9 percent of the institutions with provisions for multicultural education. The specific content and types of inservice programs

offered are outlined in the section, "Descriptive Profile of Responding Institutions."

Courses Related to Multicultural Education

Institutions which had indicated that they have some provision for multicultural education within their education unit were asked to list the specific courses offered in this area. 233 institutions (76.4% of all institutions with such provisions) listed courses at the undergraduate level which address as a component or major emphasis multicultural education. 51 institutions (16.7%) listed dual level courses; 78 (25.6%) listed graduate courses; and 4 (1.3%) listed courses for some other level, usually inservice workshops. The range for the number of courses offered at these levels and the mean number of courses offered are listed below:

Degree Level	Courses		Frequency of Responses
	Range	Mean	
Undergraduate	1-57	5.0	233
Dual	1-20	3.1	51
Graduate	1-19	3.2	78
Other	1-5	2.8	4

Based on an analysis of the course titles provided by the respondent on the survey instrument or in the institution's catalog, these courses were classified according to what appeared to be the major focus of the course. These are identified with the frequency of occurence at each degree level in the following chart:

Focus of Course	Undergraduate	Dual	Graduate	Other
GENERAL				
Anthropology	10	2	1	
Child Development/Human Growth	7		1	
English	4	1		
Family Life	4			
Geography	1			
History	3			
Housing	1			
Humanities			1	
Political Science	1			
Psychology	13	3		
Religion	1			
Sociology	11	5	3	
INTERNATIONAL				
Africa	7			
Asian Caribbean	1			
Latin America	2			
Mexico	1			
Mideast	1		1	
Oceania	1			
South America	1		1	
Third World	4			
ETHNIC/CULTURAL STUDIES				
Afro American Studies	83	1		
American Indian Studies	31	13	4	
Chicano Studies	13	1	1	
Ethnic/Cultural/Minority Studies	21	1	2	
Hispanic Studies	3			
Puerto Rican Studies	12			
Women Studies	20		2	
EDUCATION				
Comparative/International Education	1	4	5	
Curriculum and Instruction	9	4	3	
Early Childhood Education	7		3	
Elementary Education	25		7	
Education Philosophy	6		3	3
Education Policy		1		
Education Psychology	4	2	6	
Education Sociology	17		10	1
English as a Second Language	2		1	
Foundations of Education	42	4	4	
General Education	1		1	

History of Education	6		1	
Human/Race/Ethnic Relations	22	5	8	
Instructional Media and Materials	2			
Intermediate Grades	1			
Introduction to Teaching/Education	9			
Multicultural Education	30	9	22	
School-Community Relations			3	
Secondary Education	16		1	
Socio-Cultural Foundations	1		1	1
Special Education	9	6		
Student Teaching/Practicum/ Internship	21			1
Teaching Strategies/Methods	24			
Urban Education	10	6	7	
EDUCATION METHODS				
Art	2			
Business	2			
Foreign Language	2			
Language Arts	18		3	
Linguistics	1	1	2	
Mathematics	4			
Music	2			
Physical Education	1			
Reading	12	4	1	
Science	2			
Social Studies	22	1	3	
MISCELLANEOUS				
Disadvantaged	7	1	3	
Exceptional Children	6		1	
Minorities/Culturally Different	16	4	8	
UNIDENTIFIED EXCEPT BY COURSE NUMBER				
Business	1			
Economics	2			
Education	237	28	45	5

Titles of courses with a multicultural focus included the following:

Cultural and Ethnic Influence of Family and Child
Multiethnic Education
Workshop for School Personnel - Multicultural Studies
Multicultural Awareness
Methods: Multicultural - Bilingual Education
Multicultural Concepts and Education Systems
Module: Multicultural and Human Relations
Multicultural Education Practicum on Indian Education
Teaching in Multiethnic Schools
Teaching in a Multicultural Society
Multicultural Education
Principles of Multicultural Education

Concepts and Strategies for Multiethnic Education
Cultural Pluralism in American Education
Instructional Strategies of Multicultural Education
Philosophical/Psychological Foundations of Multicultural Education
Anthropological/Sociological Foundations of Multicultural Education
Organizational and Instructional Impact of Multicultural Education
Psychology of Cultural Pluralism
Ethnicity and Education
Special Projects in Multicultural Education
Culture and Education
The Educator and Cultural Diversity
Integrating Ethnic Studies into the Classroom
Sociological and Philosophical Meanings of Cultural Pluralism
Issues in Multicultural Education

210 (68.9% of the institutions with multicultural/bilingual education provisions) indicated that at least one course with components of emphasis on multicultural or bilingual education is required of education students to complete the requirements for a degree. One or more of these courses are also required by 42 (13.8%) of the institutions for students to complete requirements for certain non-degree education programs.

Courses Related to Bilingual Education

Bilingual Education courses at the undergraduate level were listed by 95 institutions which have provisions for multicultural and/or bilingual education. This was 31.1% percent of the 305 institutions with such provisions. 26 (8.5%) of the institutions listed dual level courses; 29 (9.5%) listed graduate courses; and 10 (3.3%) listed courses at other levels usually inservice workshops. The range for the number of courses offered at these levels and the mean number of course offered are listed below:

Degree Level	Courses Range	Courses Mean	Frequency of Responses
Undergraduate	1-90	5.6	95
Dual	1-7	3.3	26

Graduate	1-14	4.1	29
Other	1-6	1.7	10

The respondent was requested to list on the survey instrument the course numbers and titles, supplementing the survey with an institution catalog of courses. Based on an analysis of the course titles, the courses related to bilingual education have been classified below by what appeared to be the major focus of the course. These are identified with the frequency of occurence at each degree level in the following chart:

Focus of Course	Undergraduate	Dual	Graduate	Other
GENERAL				
Anthropology	10	3	1	
Child Development/Human Growth	1		1	
Geography	1			
History	7			
Linguistics	7	1	2	
Philosophy	1			
Psychology	1			
Sociology	4	2	5	
INTERNATIONAL				
Africa	2			
Latin America	4			
Mexico	4			
ETHNIC/LANGUAGE STUDIES				
Afro American Studies	8	2	1	
African Languages	1			
American Indian Languages	2			
American Indian Studies	8		2	
Asian Studies			1	
Chinese Language	1			
Ethnic Studies	5			
French Language	1			
French Studies	1			
German Studies	1			
Hispanic Studies	2		1	
Mexican American Studies	9		1	
Portuguese Languages	2			
Portuguese Studies	3			

Puerto Rican Studies	19		2
Spanish American Studies	2		
Spanish Language	5	3	1
EDUCATION			
Assessment/Testing	2		5
Bilingual Education	23	12	31
Curriculum & Instruction	3		8
Early Childhood Education	1		
Education Administration			1
Education Philosophy	1		
Education Psychology	5	1	1
Education Sociology			1
Education Theory & Research			2
Elementary Education	11	5	
English as a Second Language	4	6	4
Foundations in Education	7		4
Higher Education		1	
Human/Race/Ethnic Relations		1	
Methods	8	1	3
Multicultural Education	6	3	6
Secondary Education	6	1	1
Special Education	3		1
Student Teaching/Field Experience	16	4	2
Urban Education			1
EDUCATION METHODS			
Art			1
English	11	3	1
Foreign Language	7	1	2
Health	1		
Language Arts	4	1	
Mathematics	2		1
Reading	10	1	4
Science	2		1
Social Studies	1		
MISCELLANEOUS			
Community Organizations		2	
Cultural Awareness		1	1
Disadvantaged	1	1	
Exceptional Child	3		1
UNIDENTIFIED EXCEPT BY COURSE NUMBER			
Education	81	29	41

Examples of course titles which appeared to have bilingual education as their major focus included the following:

Studies in Bilingual Education
Methods in Bilingual Education
Introduction to Bilingual Education
Science and Math for Bilingual Speakers
Reaching Reading to Bilingual Speakers
Issues in Bilingual Education
Assessment of Bilingual Children
Teaching the Bilingual-Bicultural
Materials for Bilingual Instruction
Linguistics for Bilingual Classrooms
Multilinguals in Classrooms
Past and Present Status of Bilingual Education
Bilingual Program Design and Implementation
Spanish in Multicultural Environments
Educational Problems of Dialect Speakers
Community School Relations in Bilingual Settings
Second Language Pedagogy for Bilingual Education
Child Development and Patterns of Child Rearing in Culturally Different Groups
Seminar: Administrative Issues in Bilingual Education
Seminar: Cultural Diversity and Educational Administration
Bilingual Schooling in the U.S.

Institutions with bilingual education programs were requested to identify the target languages for these programs. The following shows the target languages, the number of institutions that indicated these as target languages and the percentage of all institutions with provisions for multicultural and/or bilingual education:

Target Language	Frequency of Responses	Percent of Institutions with Multicultural/ Bilingual Provisions
Spanish	118	38.7
French	25	8.2
German	21	6.9
Italian	8	2.6
Portuguese	7	2.3
Chinese	6	2.0
Cantonese	5	1.6
Arabic	4	1.3
Choctaw	4	1.3
Japanese	4	1.3
Navajo	4	1.3
Filipino	3	1.0
Korean	3	1.0

Chaldean	2	.7
Cherokee	2	.7
Krowte	2	.7
Lokota	2	.7
Nez Perce	2	.7
Polish	2	.7
Cheyenne	1	.3
Other	17	5.6

The category for "other" included the following languages:

Language	Frequency of Response
African	2
Greek	2
Vietnamese	2
Russian	1
Laotian	1
Hebrew	1
Aleat	1
Arapahoe	1
Athabuscan	1
Crow	1
Imupiaq	1
Meraminee	1
Seminole-Creek	1
Shoshone	1
Woodland	1
Yup'ik	1

Thus Spanish is the major target language for bilingual education programs offered at the institutions responding to this survey. American Indian languages are offered with the next greatest frequency (frequency total of 27) followed by French and German. None of the other languages were reported more than 8 times.

FACULTY FOR MULTICULTURAL/BILINGUAL EDUCATION

In the section of the survey on faculty, respondents whose education unit had provisions for multicultural and/or bilingual education were asked to indicate the academic backgrounds and ethnic and sexual composition of faculty members who teach such courses. This data is presented in three different sections: (1) academic background of faculty members

who teach courses related to multicultural and or bilingual education, but are from schools, colleges, or departments other than education; (2) program areas represented by faculty members who teach courses related to multicultural and/or bilingual education and who are faculty members in the education unit; and (3) the ethnic and sexual composition of the faculty members who teach courses related to multicultural and/or bilingual education at each level of employment, i.e., full-time education faculty, split-time education faculty, and part-time education faculty.

Academic Background of Split-Time Education Faculty

The respondent was asked to indicate on question 10 the disciplines or areas of study the faculty members teaching multicultural and/or bilingual education courses from units in the institution other than education. 189 respondents completed this question. Listed below are the frequency of responses for each academic discipline listed on the survey and the percentage of the 189 respondents indicating that discipline.

Academic Discipline	Frequency	Percentage
Sociology	100	52.9
Foreign Language	95	50.3
History	83	43.9
Anthropology	62	32.8
Psychology	61	32.3
English	58	30.7
Afro American Studies	56	29.6
Music	37	19.6
Political Science	34	18.0
Art	33	17.5
Mexican American Studies	32	16.9
American Studies	32	16.9
American Indian Studies	30	15.9
Philosophy	27	14.3
Physical Education	26	13.8
Asian Studies	25	13.2
Theatre Arts/Drama	24	13.0
Mathematics	17	9.0
Economics	15	7.9

International Affairs	15	7.9
Home Economics	12	6.3
Business	11	5.8
Physical Science	10	5.3
Law	8	4.2
Agriculture	5	2.6
Other	29	15.3

"Others" specified on this question included six institutions with faculty from linguistics, three with faculty from speech, two with faculty from minority groups studies, two with faculty from reading, and two with faculty from Puerto Rican studies. A frequency of one institution was found for faculty members from the academic disciplines of bible, Latin American studies, ethnic studies, geography, religion, journalism, Black studies, library science, continuing education, English, integrated studies, folklore, social sciences, museum, allied health, bicultural-bilingual studies division, education administration, speech pathology and audiology, special education, and women's studies.

Program Areas of Full-Time and Part-Time Education Faculty

On question 11 the respondent indicated the program areas that full-time and part-time education faculty teaching multicultural/bilingual education courses represent. 244 respondents completed this question. Listed below are the frequency of responses for each program area and the percentage of the 244 institutions indicating that area.

Program Area	Frequency	Percentage
Elementary Education	170	69.7
Secondary Education	148	60.7
Social Foundations/History and Philosophy	95	38.9
Early Childhood Education	93	38.1
Curriculum and Instruction	85	34.8
Social Studies Education	80	32.8
Educational Psychology	75	30.7
Language Arts/Reading	70	28.7
Special Education	63	25.8
Jr. High/Middle School Education	63	25.8
Foreign Language Education	60	24.6
Guidance and Counseling	49	20.1

English Education	48	19.7
Administration	44	18.0
Urban Education	33	13.5
Art Education	31	12.7
Music Education	29	11.9
Science Education	29	11.9
School Psychology	27	11.1
Physical Education	26	10.7
Mathematics Education	24	9.8
Higher Education	23	9.4
Educational Testing, Measurement, and Evaluation	22	9.0
Adult/Continuing Education	21	8.6
International and Comparative Education	20	8.2
Jr/Community College Education	16	6.6
Audio-Visual Education	15	6.1
Research and Statistics	15	6.1
Home Economics Education	14	5.7
Speech/Hearing	14	5.7
Industrial Arts Education	11	4.5
Vocational Education	11	4.5
Business Education	9	3.7
Vocational Rehabilitation	8	3.3
Student Personnel	4	1.6
Agriculture Education	4	1.6
Technical/Industrial Education	4	1.6
Distributive Education	2	.8
Other	7	2.9

"Others" specified by respondents included educational foundations (2 institutions), linguistics (2 institutions), reading (1), multicultural education (1), school services - bilingual education (1), and community education (1).

Ethnic and Sexual Composition of Faculty

181 institutions indicated the ethnic and sex background of the faculty members teaching courses related to multicultural education. 73 institutions reported this information for faculty members teaching courses related to bilingual education. Each of these were reported by whether the faculty members are employed by the education unit as full-time, part-time or split time.

Faculty for Multicultural Education Courses

The following table indicates the percentage of the 181 institutions responding to this question with faculty members from different ethnic and sexual backgrounds at the three different employment levels. The range of faculty members within the different institutions is also provided.

Ethnic/Sex Background	Full-Time %	Full-Time Range	Split-Time %	Split-Time Range	Part-Time %	Part-Time Range
White American Male	64.6	1-20	8.8	1-10	5.5	1-7
White American Female	39.8	1-19	6.6	1-2	5.5	1-3
Black American Male	22.7	1-36	5.5	1-2	6.1	1-16
Black American Female	20.4	1-17	3.3	1-2	5.5	1-13
Hispanic American Male	9.9	1-4	1.1	1-1	2.8	1-5
Hispanic American Female	6.1	1-1	2.2	1-1	.6	1-1
Asian American Male	5.5	1-2	.6	1-1	0	0
Asian American Female	8.3	1-2	.6	1-1	0	0
American Indian or Eskimo Male	3.8	1-3	1.7	1-1	0	0
American Indian or Eskimo Female	.6	1-1	1.1	2-2	1.1	1-1

It appears that the majority of persons teaching courses related to multicultural education are full-time faculty members in the education unit. Less that nine percent of the institutions use split-time faculty to teach such courses, and less than six percent use part-time faculty. For full-time faculty, the majority of the reporting institutions have white male and female faculty members who are responsible for teaching the courses related to multicultural education.

The following chart shows a percentage breakdown by sex and ethnicity of the faculty teaching multicultural education courses at each level of employment:

	Full-Time	Split-Time	Part-Time
White American Male	38.25%	37.50%	16.95%
White American Female	19.63	17.50	25.42
Black American Male	19.89	15.00	20.34
Black American Female	13.52	11.25	16.95
Hispanic American Male	2.73	2.50	15.25
Hispanic American Female	1.15	5.00	1.69
Asian American Male	1.27	1.25	-0-

Asian American Female	2.17%	1.25	-0-
American Indian or Eskimo Male	1.27	3.75	-0-
American Indian or Eskimo Female	.01	5.00	3.39

The breakdown by ethnicity of these full-time faculty members is 57.88 percent white, 33.41 percent black, 3.88 percent Hispanic, 3.44 percent Asian, and 1.28 percent American Indian or Eskimo. The percentage of minority faculty teaching these specific courses in the teacher education program increases considerably over the percent of minority faculty in the full-time positions of teacher education in general. For most groups the percentage of split-time faculty is similar to that of the full-time faculty. The percentages of minority faculty, however, at the part-time level again increases for black male and female and Hispanic males.

The breakdown by sex of full-time faculty members teaching courses related to multicultural education is 36.48 percent female and 63.52 percent male. There are more women teaching these specific courses than women in full-time positions of teacher education in general. For split-time faculty, the percentage of women is 40 percent; at the part-time level, the percentage jumps to 47.45 percent women. The following shows the percentage of females within each ethnic/racial group at the various levels:

	Total Frequency	Full-Time	Split-Time	Part-Time
White American	94	33.4%	32.1%	48.6%
Black American	53	40.2	42.7	45.5
Hispanic American	16	32.0	66.7	10.0
Asian American	16	60.0	50.0	-0-
American Indian or Eskimo	5	9.3	57.1	100.0

For both the white and black groups, the percentage of women teaching multicultural education at the part-time level is greater than at any other level.

Faculty for Bilingual Education Courses

The following table indicates the percentage of the 73 institutions responding to this question with faculty members from different ethnic and sexual backgrounds at the three different employment levels. The range of faculty members within the different institutions is also provided.

Ethnic/Sex Background	Full-Time %	Range	Split-Time %	Range	Part-Time %	Range
White American Male	41.1	1-6	8.2	1-4	5.5	1-1
White American Female	34.2	1-37	15.1	1-3	6.8	1-2
Black American Male	5.5	1-1	-0-		2.7	1-1
Black American Female	4.1	1-3	1.4	1-1	1.4	1-1
Hispanic American Male	34.2	1-4	2.7	1-2	11.0	1-3
Hispanic American Female	30.1	1-8	6.8	1-3	16.4	1-3
Asian American Male	5.5	1-2	2.7	1-4	2.7	1-1
Asian American Female	8.2	1-2	-0-		1-4	1-1
American Indian or Eskimo Male	1.4	2-2	1.4	1-1	-0-	
American Indian or Eskimo Female	2.7	1-1	-0-		-0-	

The majority of persons teaching courses related to bilingual education are full-time faculty members in the education unit. Less than fifteen percent of the institutions use split-time faculty to teach such course, and less than seventeen percent use part-time faculty. For full-time faculty, the majority of the reporting institutions have white male and female faculty members teaching bilingual education. Hispanic Americans make up the next largest ethnic group teaching such courses.

The following chart shows a percentage breakdown by sex and ethnicity of the faculty teaching bilingual education courses at each level of employment:

	Full-Time	Split-Time	Part-Time
White American Male	26.08%	24.39%	6.97%
White American Female	32.80	34.15	20.93
Black American Male	.79	-0-	4.65
Black American Female	1.97	2.44	2.33
Hispanic American Male	15.41	19.51	30.23

Hispanic American Female	15.41	19.51	30.23
Asian American Male	1.97	9.75	4.65
Asian American Female	2.76	-0-	2.33
American Indian or Eskimo Male	.79	2.44	-0-
American Indian or Eskimo Female	.79	-0-	-0-

The breakdown by ethnicity of these full-time faculty members is 58.88 percent white, 2.76 percent black, 32.01 percent Hispanic, 4.73 percent Asian, and 1.58 percent American Indian or Eskimo. The percentage of Hispanic, Asian, and American Indian faculty member teaching these specific courses in the teacher education program is an increase over their percentage of full-time positions for teacher education in general. The greatest increase occurs for Hispanic Americans from 1.74 percent of the general teacher education full-time faculty to 32.01 percent of the full-time faculty teaching bilingual education. Black are less involved in teaching such courses than in other parts of the teacher education program. Except for American Indians, there is an increase in the percentage of minority faculty who teach bilingual education as part-time faculty members.

The breakdown by sex of full-time faculty members teaching courses related to bilingual education is 53.73 percent female and 46.27 percent male. There are more women teaching courses related to bilingual education with full-time positions than for the general teacher education faculty or for multicultural education. For split-time faculty, the percentage of women is 56.1 percent; at the part-time level it is 55.82 percent. The following shows the percentage of females within each ethnic/racial group at the various levels:

	Total Frequency	Full-Time	Split-Time	Part-Time
White American	41	56.3%	58.4%	69.2%
Black American	5	56.0	100.0	33.3

Hispanic American	39	48.2	72.7	50.0
Asian American	7	55.9	-0-	33.3
American Indian or Eskimo	2	50.0	-0-	-0-

For the white group, the percentage of women teaching bilingual education at the part-time level is greater than at any other level. More Hispanic women teach bilingual education as split-time faculty than at any other level. The frequencies of the other three groups were too small to make any statements concerning the differences at the various levels.

STUDENTS

Respondents from institutions with provisions for multicultural and/or bilingual education were asked to indicate the total number of students enrolled in multicultural/bilingual education courses or programs at different degree levels. The following chart indicates the frequency of institutions that responded to that section, the range of responses within the responding institutions, and the mean number of students enrolled at each level:

	Multicultural			Bilingual		
Degree Level	Frequency	Range	Mean	Frequency	Range	Mean
Bachelor	190	2-670	119.7	88	1-295	43.9
Post Bachelor (Fifth Year)	18	4-610	58.6	14	6-60	31.4
Master	71	1-660	64.1	35	1-200	40.3
Specialist	8	1-52	24.4	10	9-96	29.9
Doctor	22	1-320	29.0	14	1-100	15.9
Other	11	2-125	30.3	5	4-48	18.4

"Others" specified by the respondent included a bilingual-bicultural certification program, teaching internship, professional improvement beyond certification level, non-degree program, inservice training for teachers, multicultural education certification program, special courses, and training programs for administrators and education consultants.

Without knowing the size of the student population at the various education degree levels, it is impossible to determine the percentage of

students who are enrolled in multicultural/bilingual education programs.

MANAGEMENT OF MULTICULTURAL/BILINGUAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Respondents were asked to indicate the ways in which the multicultural/bilingual education activities within their education unit were developed and controlled/monitored. 254 respondents completed this question. The following table shows the frequency of responses for each item and the percentage of the 305 institutions with provisions for multicultural/bilingual education which indicated that type of management:

Management	Developed		Controlled/Monitored	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
By a college or institution-wide curriculum committee	70	23.0	68	22.3
By a person responsible for directing/coordinating the multicultural/bilingual efforts	84	27.5	70	23.0
By each department/program within the education unit having the prerogative to develop, control, and monitor its own multicultural programs	144	47.2	97	31.8
By a consortium with other colleges, school districts, and other agencies	29	9.5	16	5.2
By cooperative planning with local education agencies	75	24.6	22	7.2
By cooperative planning with teacher organizations	21	6.9	8	2.6
Other	25	8.2	.16	5.2

"Others" specified by respondents included regional panels of community members, community-based committee, state education agencies, state regulatory commission, individual professors within his/her own course, teacher education students, dean's office, and teacher centers.

Respondents were asked to identify the name and address of the person in their education unit who was responsible for directing/coordinating the multicultural/bilingual education efforts. This information has been compiled in a Directory of Multicultural Education Programs in U.S. Teacher Education Institutions, 1978.

Different types of consortia for developing and/or controlling and monitoring multicultural/bilingual education programs were identified by the respondents. Most often the consortium was composed of several institutions. Other types of consortia included state education agencies, local education agencies, and teacher centers. Specific ones mentioned were with a Canadian-American Center, Overseas student teaching, and the Cooperative Urban Teacher Education (CUTE) program.

Financial Support

242 different institutions reported the source of financial support for their multicultural/bilingual education programs. The following chart shows the frequency of responses for each source and the percentage of the 305 institutions with provisions for multicultural/bilingual education that indicated that source of support:

Source of Financial Support	Multicultural Frequency	Multicultural Percentage	Bilingual Frequency	Bilingual Percentage
Education Unit	165	54.1	88	28.9
Other University Sources	51	16.7	37	12.1
U.S. Office of Education	24	7.9	40	13.1
Other Federal Funds	17	5.6	16	5.2

State Education Agencies	17	5.6	16	5.2
Private Foundations	6	2.0	2	.7
Other	32	10.5	6	2.0

"Others" specified by the respondents included private organization, teacher corps, foreign governments, and gifts.

The major support for multicultural/bilingual education programs in teacher education is the budget of the education unit or other institutional sources. Federal funds are more likely to support bilingual education programs than multicultural education programs.

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN INSTITUTIONS WITH PROVISIONS FOR MULTICULTURAL EDUCATION AND OTHER INSTITUTIONS

Of the 387 institutions that returned the survey, 305 reported that they had provisions for multicultural/bilingual education while 82 institutions did not have such provisions.

Using a chi square test, differences between the institutions with provisions and institutions without such provisions were tested. The null hypothesis tested was: At the .05 level of significance, there will be no difference between institutions with provisions for multicultural/bilingual education and institutions without such provisions on their responses to the questions in the "Survey of Multicultural Education in Teacher Education."

The null hypothesis was rejected for many of the items on the survey. These will be presented in sections on programs, faculty, students, research and development, and general.

Programs Related to Multicultural Education

Question 1 listed fifteen activities related to multicultural education for which education units might have provisions. Significant differences were found for fourteen of those items. The only activity for which no significant difference was found was the "study of socioeconomics." Activities for which institutions with provisions for multicultural/bilingual education

were more likely to have provisions are shown in the table below. Frequencies for both "Yes" and "No" responses are shown as well as the level of significance based on the chi square test.

Activity	Provisions Yes	Provisions No	No Provisions Yes	No Provisions No	p
A student teaching experience in a school with students who are racially/ethnically different from the student teachers	249	52	51	27	.0014
Study of values clarification	235	56	48	30	.0006
Study of the dynamics of diverse cultures and the implications for developing appropriate teaching strategies.	218	74	19	57	.0000
Study of linguistic variations and the implications for developing appropriate teaching strategies.	149	137	19	56	.0001
Study of diverse learning styles related to ethnic/cultural difference and the implications for developing appropriate teaching strategies	200	83	15	60	.0000
Study of racism	178	111	22	54	.0000
Study of sexism	172	116	21	55	.0000
Study of intergroup communications and classroom dynamics	259	33	59	17	.0203
Study of cultures and ethnicity of those groups within the geographical region served by the education unit	198	95	25	50	.0203
Study of cultural competencies that can be transferred from one cultural or multicultural setting to another	133	145	13	63	.0000
Study of specific ethnic groups within the U.S. (i.e., Afro American Studies, Mexican-American Studies)	154	132	20	56	.0000

Study of foreign cultures	121	163	17	58	.0025
Experiences which prepare education personnel to work more effectively with minority students	243	47	43	33	.0000
Experiences which prepare education personnel to teach content from a multicultural perspective	182	159	19	58	.0000

Differences also existed in the two groups' assessment of the educational desirability of one of these activities. Institutions with provisions for multicultural/bilingual education were more likely to feel that experiences which prepare education personnel to teach content from a multicultural perspective was educationally desirable than institutions without such provisions. The table below shows the data for this item.'

Activity	Provisions Desirable (3)		Not Desirable	Provisions Desirable (3)		Not Desirable	P
Experiences which prepare education personnel to teach content from a multicultural perspective	243	29	7	44	18	5	.0002

Ethnic Studies

Institutions with provisions for multicultural education were more likely to have courses and departments/divisions related to U.S. ethnic groups. The following table shows the frequency of responses for the two groups on question 2, "Does your institution offer any courses or have any departments/divisions related to U.S. ethnic groups (e.g., Black Studies, Native American Studies)?"

	Yes	No	P
Provisions	243	55	.0016
No Provisions			

Women's Studies

Institutions with provisions for multicultural/bilingual education were

Also more likely to have courses related to women's studies. The following table shows the frequency of responses for the two groups on question 3.

	Yes	No	P
Provisions	192	99	.0037
No Provisions	33	38	

Inservice Programs

Institutions with provisions for multicultural/bilingual education were more likely to offer inservice programs in multicultural/bilingual education as an independent unit or in cooperation with a local education agency, teacher center or other agency. The following table shows the frequency of responses for the two groups on question 4.

	Yes	No	P
Provisions	134	160	.0001
No Provisions	16	61	

Faculty

The percentage of minority faculty in teacher education institutions was greater at institutions with provisions for multicultural/bilingual education than for institutions without such provisions. The ethnic/racial background of faculty members at different employment levels is shown below as percentage of total faculty:

	FULL-TIME		SPLIT-TIME		PART-TIME	
	Prov	No Prov	Prov	No Prov	Prov	No Prov
White Americans	89.19%	94.40%	87.24%	93.7%	89.79%	94.6%
Black Americans	7.29	4.50	6.53	3.9	5.51	3.3
Hispanic Americans	1.83	.90	4.80	.7	2.95	2.1
Asian Americans	1.30	.80	.87	1.6	1.12	-0-
American Indian or Eskimo	.37	.10	.55	-0-	.63	-0-

Except for split-time faculty members, the percentage of female faculty members was higher at institutions with provisions for multicultural/bilingual education than for institutions without such provisions. Only at the part-time level did females compose near half of the teacher education faculty. The percentages of male and female faculty members are shown below by employment level and whether or not the institution had provisions for multicultural/bilingual education.

	FULL-TIME		SPLIT-TIME		PART-TIME	
	Prov	No Prov	Prov	No Prov	Prov	No Prov
Males	67.52%	68.7%	70.36%	67.21%	50.94%	54.68%
Females	32.48	31.3	29.64	32.79	49.06	45.38

Differences also existed in the way that the concept of multicultural/bilingual education has been fostered among faculty members in the education unit.(question 9). The following table lists the activities for faculty development, frequency of responses for the two types of institutions, and the level of significance when P .05:

	MULTICULTURAL ED					BILINGUAL ED				
	Prov		No Prov			Prov		No Prov		
Activity	Yes	No	Yes	No	P .05	Yes	No	Yes	No	P=.05
Professional Association Meetings	169	136	20	62	.0000	96	209	11	71	.0019
Seminars/Symposiums	109	196	11	71	.0002	64	241	6	76	.0071
Inservice Training for Faculty	60	245	6	76	.0133	27	278	3	79	
Cross-Cultural Field Experiences	104	201	14	68	.0045	55	250	6	76	.0283
Sabbatical(s) for Projects Related to Multicultural/ Bilingual Education	35	270	2	80		27	278	2	80	
Faculty Research Grants for Multi-cultural Bilingual Education Projects	44	261	3	79		34	271	3	79	
Faculty is on Their Own with Respect to Multicultural Bilingual Education	139	166	37	45		84	221	27	55	

Students

Based on the figures reported on question 16, institutions without provisions for multicultural/bilingual education have a higher percentage of black students in the total institution, in undergraduate education, and in graduate education than institutions with such provision. The percentage of Hispanic, Asian and American Indian or Eskimo students, on the other hand, is higher in institutions with provisions. These figures are presented for the five ethnic/racial groups below as a percentage of the total student population at the institution, in undergraduate education, and in graduate education.

	Total Institution		UnderGraduate Ed		Graduate Ed	
	Prov	No Prov	Prov	No Prov	Prov	No Prov
White Americans	88.27%	89.59%	89.77%	86.52%	89.05%	88.09%
Black Americans	7.64	7.72	7.96	12.15	5.59	10.65
Hispanic Americans	2.43	1.88	2.23	.89	2.15	.54
Asian Americans	1.12	.51	.99	.26	2.71	.62
American Indians	.52	.19	.85	.25	.48	.11

Institutions without provisions for multicultural/bilingual education also had a higher percentage of females in the total institution and graduate education programs than institutions with provisions. The percentage of students based on sex is presented below:

	Total Institution		Undergraduate Ed		Graduate Ed	
	Prov	No Prov	Prov	No Prov	Prov	No Prov
Males	52.69%	50.51%	40.78%	46.78%	43.94%	34.88%
Females	47.31	49.49	59.22	53.22	56.06	65.12

In response to question 11, "If your institution or education unit maintains data about the employment of the teacher education graduates, please

indicate the percentage of those graduates working in the following education situations," a greater percentage of institutions with provisions for multicultural/bilingual education reported graduates in inner city schools and bilingual classrooms/schools. A greater percentage of graduates from schools without provisions, however, teach on American Indian reservations. The following table lists the employment situations, the institutions with and without provisions that reported students in the particular situation, and the percentage of all institutions within that group whose graduates are in such situations:

	Provisions		No Provisions	
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
Inner City Schools	66	21.6	13	15.9
Bilingual Classrooms/Schools	34	11.1	5	6.1
American Indian Reservations	26	8.5	8	9.8

Research and Development

Significant differences existed on four items in this section of the survey. Institutions with provisions for multicultural/bilingual education were more likely to have faculty projects related to research in multicultural education undertaken. The following table indicates the frequency of responses on this item in question 18 and the level of significance found:

	Yes	No	P
Provisions	68	237	.0083
No Provisions	7	75	

Differences were found in the source of support for research activities related to multicultural education. Institutions with provisions for multicultural/bilingual education were more likely to have support from the college or university than institutions without provisions. The following table indicates the frequency of responses on this item in question 18b and the level of significance found:

	Yes	No	P
Provisions	65	240	.0132
No Provisions	7	75	

For both multicultural and bilingual education, significant differences were found for question 19 concerning products produced by members of the education faculty. Faculty members in institutions with provisions were more likely to make presentations at practitioner-oriented meetings. The following table indicates the frequency of responses on this item and the level of significance for both multicultural and bilingual education.

	Multicultural		Bilingual	
	Yes	No	Yes	No
Provisions	90	215	58	247
No Provisions	9	73	7	75
	P = .0011		P = .0369	

Differences were found also on the item in question 19 concerned with faculty producing education products for local or regional dissemination in the area of multicultural education. The following table indicates the frequency of responses on this item and the level of significance found:

	Yes	No Response	P=.05
Provisions	90	215	.0011
No Provisions	9	73	

In the area of research and development few significant differences existed between institution with and without provisions for multicultural/bilingual education. On only five out of 70 discrete items were significant differences found.

General

Differences were found between institutions with and without provisions for multicultural/bilingual education on four factors in question 20. The responses for these factors fell along a continuum from "major contributing" to "no influence" to "major deterrent." Because the frequency of responses in the (4) and (5) cells was often less than five, the cells at both ends of the continuum were collapsed together for this analysis. The four factors for which differences were found on the chi square test are reported in the table below:

Faculty Qualified to Teach

	Provisions			NO PROVISIONS			
	Contribution	No Influence	Deterrent	Contribution	No Influence	Deterrent	P
Faculty Qualified to Teach Multicultural/Bilingual Education	131	35	94	10	15	29	.0001
State Education Agency Guidelines and/or Regulations Related to Multicultural/Bilingual Education	126	85	23	14	23	6	.0370
State Legislation Related to Multicultural/Bilingual Education	105	105	23	10	26	6	.0365
University/College Administration	134	94	15	17	21	7	.0278

All four factors above were more likely to be felt as contributing factors to the development of multicultural/bilingual education programs by institutions with provisions for multicultural/bilingual education than by institutions without such provisions. In all cases, institutions without provisions were more likely to feel these factors were of no influence or a deterrent to the development of multicultural/bilingual education programs.

On the question concerning services desired from AACTE, significant differences between the two groups were found on five of the items. These are listed in the table below by frequency of responses and level of significance for each of the five items.

	Provisions		No Provisions		P
	Yes	No	Yes	No	
Publish a journal or bulletin that informs teacher educators of new ideas, approaches, or materials in multicultural education	189	116	37	45	.0088
Provide consultation on development of proposals and research d designs for submission to federal agencies	108	197	19	63	.0497
Catalogue information about funding agencies to disseminate as a directory	144	161	28	54	.0467
Facilitate the dissemination of information about operationally and programmatically successful multicultural programs	186	119	33	49	.0012
Provide a clearinghouse for informational, research and analytical studies of multicultural education	164	141	33	49	.0403

Again, institutions with provisions for multicultural/bilingual education are more likely to desire these five services from AACTE than institutions without provisions.

Using demographic data about the institutions that responded to the survey, the following

1. There will be no difference between public and private institutions on their responses to the question in the "Survey of Multicultural Education in Teacher Education."

2. There will be no difference between NCATE accredited and non-NCATE accredited institutions on their responses to the questions in the "Survey of Multicultural Education in Teacher Education."

3. There will be no difference in the responses of institutions based on the geographical region of the U.S. in which they are located on their responses to the questions in the "Survey of Multicultural Educcation in Teacher Education."

4. There will be no difference in the responses of institutions based on the population of the city or area in which they are located on their responses to the questions in the "Survey of Multicultural Education in Teacher Education."

5. There will be difference in the responses of institutions based on the size of the student population for the institution on their responses to the questions in the "Survey of Multicultural Education in Teacher Education."

The chi square test of the Social Science Statistical Package was used to test these null hypothese for all items in the survey that had nominal data response, and which all respondents were expected to answer. 202 variables were tested for significant differences in each of the five null hypothese above. The statistical analysis is described in greater detail under methodology in the first section of this report.

The null hypotheses was rejected for some variables in each of the five categories. These differences will be presented in this section in those same five categories: (1) Public and private Institutions; (2) NCATE Accredited and Non-NCATE Accredited Institutions; (3) Geographical Region of the Institution; (4) Population of City or Area in which the Institution is located; and (5) Size of the Institution.

PUBLIC AND PRIVATE INSTITUTIONS

The respondents to this survey included 199 public institutions or 51.4% of all those responding. 188 or 46.6% of the respondents were from private institutions. Using a chi square test, differences were found between some of responses of the two types of institutions at $P \leq .05$. Significant differences reported here include only those items for which there was a frequency of at least 5 in each cell.

Significant differences in responses were found for 62 different items on the questionnaire. These include fifteen items in the section on programs; two items in the section on faculty; ten items in the section on management; twenty-six items in the section on research and development; and nine items in the general section. These differences are reported by sections as identified above.

Programs Related to Multicultural Education

The education units in public institutions were more likely than private institutions to have provisions for six different activities: (1) study of diverse learning styles related to ethnic/cultural differences and the implications for developing appropriate teaching strategies; (2) experiences which prepare education personnel to teach content from a multicultural perspective; (3) study of specific ethnic groups within the U.S.; (4) study of linguistic variations and the implications for developing appropriate teaching strategies; (5) study of cultural competencies that can be transferred from one cultural or multicultural setting to another; and (6) study of socioeconomics. The table below lists the observed frequency of responses for private and public institutions on question #1 concerning provisions for activities related to multicultural education. An asterisk (*) indicates those activities for which $P \leq .05$ on the chi square test; the

level of significance is shown only for those activities found significant.

Activity	Public		Private		P
	Yes	No	Yes	No	
Study of intergroup communications and classroom dynamics	169	22	149	28	
A student teaching experience in a school with students who are racially/ethnically different from the student teachers	161	36	139	43	
Experiences which prepare education personnel to work more effectively with minority students	153	35	133	45	
Study of values clarification	149	42	134	44	
Study of the dynamics of diverse cultures and the implications for developing appropriate teaching strategies	131	60	106	71	
Study of cultures and ethnicity of those groups within the geographical region served by the education unit	125	66	98	79	
*Study of diverse learning styles related to cultural difference and the implications for developing appropriate teaching strategies	123	62	92	81	.0139
*Experiences which prepare education personnel to teach content from a multicultural perspective	113	71	88	88	.0381
Study of racism	106	82	94	83	
Study of sexism	98	90	95	81	

*Study of socioeconomics	105	75	75	98	.0068
*Study of specific ethnic groups within the U.S. (i.e., Afro American Studies, Mexican American Studies)	103	83	71	105	.0058
*Study of Linguistic variations and the implications for developing appropriate teaching strategies	100	87	68	106	.0084
*Study of cultural competencies that can be transferred from one cultural or multicultural setting to another	84	96	62	112	.0455
Study of foreign cultures	71	113	67	108	

There were no differences found between private and public institutions in their assessment of the educational desirability of these fifteen activities.

Ethnic Studies

Public institutions were more likely to offer courses or have departments/divisions related to U.S. ethnic groups (e.g., Black Studies, Native American Studies) than private institutions. 170 public institutions responded "yes" to this question (no. 2) compared to 123 private institutions. Based on a chi square test, a P = .0000 was found.

Women's Studies

Public institutions were also more likely to have both courses and departments/divisions related to women's studies than private institutions. 132 public institutions indicated that they have courses compared to 93 private institutions. A P = .0006 was found. In addition, 35 public institutions have departments/divisions while 18 private institutions have

such which was significant with a P = .0291.

Inservice Programs

98 public institutions provide inservice programs in multicultural/bilingual education while 52 private institutions provide such inservice programs. Using the chi square test, a P = .0000 was found. Again public institutions were more likely than private institutions to offer multicultural/bilingual education through inservice programs.

Provisions for Bilingual Education

Public institutions were more likely to have provisions for bilingual education than private institutions. The following table shows the frequency of responses for ways in which bilingual education is addressed in the education unit of these two types of institutions as well as the level of significance when P≤.05:

	PUBLIC		PRIVATE		
	Yes	No	Yes	No	P=.05
Component in Foundations Course(s)	50	149	30	158	.0357
Component in Methodology Course(s)	50	149	35	153	
Major Emphasis in Course(s)	33	166	13	175	.0054
Major or Specialization Offered	39	160	17	171	.0050
Minor or Supplementary Offered	35	164	15	173	.0077
Department/Division	21	178	7	181	.0166

Although less than 100 institutions had any of the above provisions for bilingual education programs, public institutions were more likely to provide bilingual education programs than private institutions.

Faculty

A significant difference between public and private institutions was found on two items in the section on faculty. In the area of faculty development, the faculty members at public institutions were more likely to receive faculty research grants for both multicultural and bilingual education projects than faculty members from private institutions. The following table indicates the responses on this item for both multicultural and bilingual education:

	Public		Private		
	Yes	No	Yes	No	P
Multicultural Ed	32	167	15	173	.0224
Bilingual Ed	27	172	10	178	.0097

Although faculty research grants in either multicultural or bilingual education were not often used by education units to foster the concept of multicultural/bilingual education, they were more likely to be used in public than private institutions.

Management

Differences existed in the ways in which multicultural/bilingual education activities within the education unit were either developed or controlled/monitored. Public institutions were more likely to develop these programs by two means listed in question 13. The responses for these items are listed below with the frequency responses and the level of significance when $P \leq .05$:

	Public		Private		
	Yes	No	Yes	No	P.≤05
By a college or institution-wide curriculum committee	42	157	28	160	
By a person responsible for directing/coordinating multicultural/bilingual education	50	149	34	154	

	Public Yes	Public No	Private Yes	Private No	P
By each department/program within the education unit having the prerogative to develop its own multicultural education programs	87	112	57	131	.0088
By a consortium with other colleges, school districts, and other agencies	17	182	12	176	
By cooperative planning with local education agencies	50	149	25	163	.0049
By cooperative planning with teacher organizations	11	188	10	178	

The multicultural/bilingual education programs are also more likely to be monitored by a college or institution-wide curriculm committee in public institutions than in private institutions. The following table indicates the responses to that item:

	Public Yes	Public No	Private Yes	Private No	P
By college or institution-wide curriculum committee	47	152	21	167	.0021

On question 14 respondents indicated from where the financial support for multicultural/bilingual programs comes. Again there were differences between public and private institutions on the responses. The education unit was more likely to provide support for public institution than private institutions for both multicultural and bilingual education programs. For bilingual education programs support from U.S.O.E. was more likely in public than private institutions. The frequency of responses for these sources and the level of significance are provided in the following table:

	Public Yes	Public No	Private Yes	Private No	P
Multicultural Education Unit	98	101	67	121	.0093

Bilingual Education					
Education Unit	57	142	31	157	.0063
U.S.O.E.	28	171	12	176	.0206

Differences were found between public and private institutions and the types of resources utilized by faculty and students in the implementation of multicultural/bilingual education programs. Public institutions were more likely to use (1) a center for ethnic studies/or multicultural education/or bilingual education; (2) textbooks related to multicultural education; (3) ethnic agencies/organizations; and (4) cooperative programs with public or private schools that have a multicultural student population. The following table shows the frequency of responses for both types of institutions.

Resources	Public		Private		P .05
	Yes	No	Yes	No	
Center for Ethnic Studies/ Multicultural Education/ Bilingual Education	46	153	24	164	.0120
Textbooks	131	58	82	106	.0000
Ethnic Agencies/ Organizations	72	127	46	142	.0168
Cooperative programs with public or private schools that have a multicultural student population	76	123	52	136	.0364

Research and Development

Differences were found between public and private institutions on several items in the section on research and development. On question 18 public institutions were more likely to have four types of research activity for both multicultural and bilingual education.as shown in the following table:

	Public		Private		
Multicultural Education	Yes	No	Yes	No	P .05
Master Theses	34	165	11	177	.0010
Doctoral Dissertations	25	174	6	182	.0013
Faculty Projects	54	145	21	167	.0001
Sponsored Research	31	168	9	179	.0009
Special Institutes	19	180	10	178	
Bilingual Education					
Master Theses	23	176	10	178	.0440
Doctoral Dissertations	22	177	6	182	.0053
Faculty Projects	36	163	12	176	.0008
Sponsored Research	18	181	6	182	.0296
Special Institutes	15	184	7	181	

The nature of the research undertaken by the education units of public and private institutions also differed. Faculty members in public institutions were more likely to conduct research related to multicultural education in the area of social/cultural processes, instructional processes, and culturally-biased tests. Graduate students of public institutions were more likely to do research related to multicultural education in the area of instructional

processes. The table with the frequencies and level of significance for the research activities related to multicultural education where differences were found to be significant on the chi square test follows:

Faculty Research	Public Yes	Public No	Private Yes	Private No	P
On Social/Cultural Processes	32	167	15	173	.0224
On Instructional Processes	34	165	13	175	.0037
On Culturally-Biased Tests and Other Measurement Instruments Influenced by Cultural Differences	17	182	6	182	.0444
Graduate Research					
On Instructional Processes	22	177	9	179	.0373

Both faculty members and graduate students at public institutions are likely to conduct research related to bilingual education in the area of instructional processes. There were no differences found in the research undertaken by faculty and graduate students in all other areas listed in the survey. The one significant difference found is reported in the table below:

Faculty Research	Public Yes	Public No	Private Yes	Private No	P
On Instructional Processes	23	176	7	181	.0071
Graduate Research					
On Instructional Processes	28	171	8	180	.0016

In the area of support for research in multicultural/bilingual education (question 18b) a significant difference existed on one item. Support was more likely to come from the college or university itself in public than in private institutions. The following table shows the frequency of responses and level of significance for this item:

Multicultural Education	Public Yes	Public No	Private Yes	Private No	P
College or University	54	145	18	170	.0000
Bilingual Education					
College or University	36	163	13	175	.0016

Significant differences were found on ten of the items in question 19 which asked about the products produced by member of the education unit related to multicultural/bilingual education. The faculty members of public institutions were more likely to produce products in both multicultural and bilingual education. The following table shows the frequency of responses for both types of institutions and the level of significance when P .05. The first section of the table indicates products for multicultural education specifically; the second section indicates those specifically for bilingual education.

Multicultural Education	Public Yes	Public No	Private Yes	Private No	P .05
Publications in Practitioner-Oriented Journals	69	130	30	158	.0000
Presentations at Practitioner-Oriented Meetings	17	182	6	182	.0444
Publication in Research-Oriented Journals	28	171	14	174	

Presentations at Research-Oriented Meetings	34	165	9	179	.0002
Publications in Books	42	157	14	174	.0002
Educational Products for Local or Regional Dissemination	24	175	7	181	.0046
Educational Products for National Dissemination	9	190	6	182	
Bilingual Education					
Publications in Practitioner Oriented Journals	22	177	4	184	
Presentations at Practitioner-Oriented Meetings	47	152	18	170	.0004
Publications in Research-Oriented Journals	13	186	4	184	
Presentations at Research-Oriented Meetings	20	179	6	182	.0128
Publications in Books	26	173	7	181	.0019
Educational Products for Local/Regional Dissemination	32	167	9	179	.0006
Educational Products for National Dissemination	22	177	7	181	.0109

Thus, it appears that more research related to multicultural/bilingual education was undertaken in the education units of public than in private institutions. Faculty members in public institutions were also more likely to produce products for multicultural/bilingual education.

General

In two areas differences existed between public and private institutions on the factors felt to contribute or deter the development of multicultural/bilingual education. The availability of federal and state funds contributed more to the development and implementation of such programs at public than private institutions. The availability of state funds

both contributed and deterred the development and implementation of these programs more for public than private institutions. Private institutions were more likely to feel that state funds had no influence on these programs. The chart below shows the frequency of responses for these items and the level of significance for each.

Factor	Contribution		No Influence		Deterrent		P
	Priv	Pub	Priv	Pub	Priv	Pub	
Availability of federal funds	22	51	59	55	50	47	.0064
Availability of state funds	15	37	61	50	50	64	.0069

Public institutions also were more likely to feel that AACTE should provide certain services related to multicultural education than private institutions. The services listed on the survey are shown below with the frequencies of responses from public and private institutions. The value of the significant difference is also shown.

AACTE Services	Public		Private		P .05
	Yes	No	Yes	No	
Publish a journal of bulletin that informs teacher educators of new ideas, approaches, or materials in multicultural education	119	80	107	81	
Stimulate research and analysis on various aspects of multicultural education through covening task forces	83	116	46	142	.0005
Provide consultation on development of proposals and research designs for submission to federal agencies	82	117	45	143	.0005

Catalogue information about funding agencies to disseminate as a directory	102	97	70	118	.0075
Facilitate the dissemination of information about operationally and programmatically successful multicultural programs	126	73	92	96	.0118
Maintain a consultative service on multicultural teacher education that can match expertise to needs at all levels	90	109	54	134	.0011
Convene national or regional meetings on multicultural education	86	113	63	125	
Provide a clearinghouse for information, research and analytical studies of multicultural education	110	89	86	102	
Conduct research and analytical studies of multicultural education	69	130	39	149	.0033
Provide information about federal and state legislation	97	102	72	116	.0490

NCATE ACCREDITED AND NON-NCATE ACCREDITED INSTITUTIONS

The majority of the institutions that responded to the survey were NCATE-accredited. 273 institutions were accredited; 114 were not accredited by NCATE. Differences between these two types of institutions were found on 25 different variables in the survey. Eight of these differences occured in the section on programs; three in faculty; six in management; four in research and development; and four in the general section.

Programs Related to Multicultural Education

On the first question about specific activities for which the education unit has provisions, differences were observed for five different

activities. NCATE-accredited institutions were more likely to have these five activities than non-accredited Institutions. The following table shows the five activities, the frequency of responses for both types of institutions, and the level of significance.

Activities	Accredited		Non Accredited		
	Yes	No	Yes	No	P
Study of Values Clarification	208	52	75	34	.0289
Study of diverse learning styles related to ethnic/ cultural difference and the implications for developing appropriate teaching strategies	164	91	51	52	.0136
Study of racism	152	108	48	57	.0358
Study of cultures and ethnicity of those groups within the geographical region served by the education unit	169	92	54	54	.0151
Experiences which prepare education personnel to teach content from a multicultural perspective	152	103	49	56	.0331

Ethnic Studies

Accredited institutions were more likely to have courses and departments related to U.S. ethnic groups than non-accredited institutions. 222 accredited institutions have such courses and/or departments while only 71 non-accredited institutions have them as can be seen in the following table:

	Yes	No	P
Accredited	222	47	.0011
Non-Accredited	71	36	

Women's Studies

170 of the accredited institutions reported that they have courses related to women's studies. 55 non-accredited institutions, on the other hand, have women's studies courses. The responses to this question are shown in the following table:

	Yes	No	P
Accredited	170	89	.0407
Non-Accredited	55	48	

Provisions for Bilingual Education

On question 5 concerning how multicultural/bilingual education were addressed in the institution's education unit, a difference existed for one item. Accredited institutions were more likely to have provisions for bilingual education as a major emphasis in courses than non-accredited institutions. The following table shows the responses to that item.

	Yes	No	P
Accredited	39	234	.0371
Non-Accredited	7	107	

Faculty

In the section on faculty, differences existed in the ways in which the concept of multicultural/bilingual education has been fostered among faculty members in the education unit. Faculty members in NCATE-accredited institutions were more likely to learn about multicultural education through professional association meetings and faculty research grants than non-accredited institutions. Faculty members in NCATE-accredited institutions

were also more likely to have faculty research grants for bilingual education than non-accredited institutions. This data is reported in the following table:

	Accredited Yes	Accredited No	Non-Accredited Yes	Non-Accredited No	P
Multicultural Education					
Professional Association Meetings	143	130	46	68	.0407
Faculty Research Grants	42	231	5	109	.0044
Bilingual Education					
Faculty Research Grants	32	241	5	109	.0406

Management

Differences were found on one item in question 13 concerning the ways in which multicultural/bilingual education activities within the education unit were developed and controlled/monitored. Accredited institutions were more likely to have programs developed by each department/program within the education unit using their own prerogative to develop such programs. The frequency of responses and the level of significance are reported in the following table:

	Yes	No	P
Accredited	113	160	.0118
Non-Accredited	31	83	

For multicultural education programs in the education unit, accredited institutions were more likely to use university sources for funding the multicultural education program in addition to the funds available through the education unit itself. On the question about

financial support for multicultural/bilingual education programs (question 14), this was the only difference found. The following table shows the responses for the item, "Other University Sources."

	Yes	No	P
Accredited	43	230	.0315
Non-Accredited	8	106	

On question 15 concerning resources utilized by faculty and students in the implementation of multicultural/bilingual education, accredited institutions were more likely than non-accredited institutions to have some of the resources. The following table shows the resources listed for this question, the frequency of responses for both types of institutions, and the level of significance when $P \leq .05$.

Resources	Accredited		Non-Accredited		P
	Yes	No	Yes	No	
Center for Ethnic Studies/ Multicultural Education/ Bilingual-Bicultural Education	54	210	16	98	
Textbooks	162	111	51	63	.0117
Ethnic agencies/ organizations	90	183	28	86	
Consultants who are not part of the university faculty	103	170	29	85	.0273
Cooperative programs with public or private schools that have a multicultural student population	95	178	33	81	
Cooperative programs with public or private schools that have a student population with different ethnic backgrounds than the majority of students in the teacher education program	98	175	26	88	.0166

Student experiences in cultural settings different than that of the teacher education student	130	143	33	81	.001
Community-based program as some phase of the student's work	91	182	28	86	

Research and Development

Differences existed on some of the items in three of the questions in this section of the survey: types of research activities, support for research, and products produced by faculty members in the education unit. NCATE-accredited institutions were more likely to have research activities for bilingual education carried out through faculty projects. The following table shows the frequency of responses for this item:

	Yes	No	P
Accredited	42	231	.0098
Non-accredited	6	108	

Accredited institutions were more likely to receive support from the college or university for research activities in both multicultural and bilingual education than non-accredited institutions. Frequency of responses and the level of significance based on the chi square test are indicated below for support from the college or university.

	Accredited		Non-Accredited		
	Yes	No	Yes	No	P
Multicultural Education Research	60	213	12	102	.0126
Bilingual Education Research	43	230	6	108	.0078

Faculty members at accredited institutions were also more likely to make presentations on bilingual education at practitioner-oriented meetings than their counterparts at non-accredited institutions. Frequency of responses for that item are reported in the following table:

	Yes	No	P
Accredited	54	219	.0225
Non-Accredited	11	103	

General

Differences between accredited and non-accredited institutions existed for one of the fourteen factors listed in question 20 as contributing or deterring factors in the development and implementation of multicultural/bilingual education. Accredited institutions were more likely to feel that faculty qualified to teach multicultural/bilingual education was either a contributing or deterring factor. Non-accredited institutions were more likely to feel that it had no influence.

The following table shows the frequency of responses and level of significance for this factor:

	Contributing	No Influence	Deterrent	P
Accredited	108	29	93	.0289
Non-Accredited	33	21	30	

Accredited and non-accredited institutions also differed on three of the services that they would like to see AACTE provide to assist them in the planning, developing, and implementing of multicultural education programs. Those services where differences were found on the chi square test are indicated in the following table:

AACTE Services	Accredited		Non-Accredited		P
	Yes	No	Yes	No	
Facilitate the Dissemination of information about operationally and programatically successful multicultural programs	165	108	54	60	.0243
Maintain a consultative service on multicultural teacher education that can match expertise to needs at all levels	113	160	31	83	.0118
Provide a clearinghouse for informational, research and analytical studies of multicultural education	118	155	31	83	.0045

As can be observed from the table, accredited institutions are more likely to desire the provision of these three services than non-accredited institutions.

GEOGRAPHICAL REGION OF THE INSTITUTION

The 387 institutions that responded to the survey were located in various geographical regions of the United States. For this analysis, the U.S. and its territories were divided into five regional areas as follows:

1. Northeast included the states of Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, New York, Pennsylvania, Connecticut, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, New Jersey, Delaware, Maryland, and the District of Columbia;

2. Southeast included West Virginia, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Kentucky, Tennessee, Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, and Arkansas;

3. The Midwest included Ohio, Indiana, Michigan, Minnesota, Wisconsin, Illinois, Missouri, Iowa, North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, and Kansas;

4. Southwest included Oklahoma, Texas, New Mexico, Colorado, Utah, and Arizona.

5. West included Wyoming, Montana, Idaho, Washington, Oregon, Nevada, California, Alaska and Hawaii.

Of the 387 responding institutions, 17.3 percent were from the Northeast; 23.3 percent from the Southeast; 39.5 percent from the Midwest; 10.3 percent from the Southwest; and 8.0 percent from the West.

Significant differences in responses were found for 31 different items on the questionnaire. These included twelve items in the section on programs; four items in the section on faculty; eight items in the section on management; three items in the section on research and development; and four items in the general section. These differences are reported by the area in the following section.

Programs Related to Multicultural Education

Institutions in the West were more likely to have certain activities related to multicultural education than any other region. For the six activities for which a significant difference was found, institutions in the West were always more likely to have those activities. Institutions in the Southwest were also more likely to have provisions for (1) the study of the dynamics of diverse cultures and the implications for developing appropriate teaching strategies and (2) the study of linguistic variations and the implications for developing appropriate teaching strategies than those in the Midwest, Northeast, and Southeast. For the

variable, "study of foreign cultures," the Northeast and West more likely to have that provision than those in other regions of the country. On two of the variables institutions in the Southwest were more likely not to have provisions than any other region. These were the (1) study of foreign cultures and (2) study of socioeconomics. Institutions in the Midwest were more likely not to have provisions for the study of linguistic variations and the implications for developing appropriate teaching strategies than any other region. The following table reports the six variables from question 1 for which significant differences were found:

	Northeast		Southeast		Midwest		Southwest		West		P
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	
Study of the dynamics of diverse cultures and the implications for developing appropriate teaching strategies	38	26	47	38	94	51	31	8	24	5	.0177
Study of linguistic variations and the implications for developing appropriate teaching strategies	31	29	39	45	53	91	23	16	18	10	.0168
Study of Sexism	33	29	36	49	86	60	16	21	20	8	.0251
Study of cultural competencies that can be transferred from one cultural or multicultural setting to another	22	37	27	57	58	84	19	18	17	10	.0390
Study of foreign cultures	29	27	33	55	55	91	7	31	13	13	.0163

Study of socio-economics	29	26	47	39	68	75	12	24	19	8	.0457

There were no significant differences found in whether courses related to U.S. ethnic groups were available in institutions located in different regions of the country.

Women's Studies

Institutions in the West were more likely to have courses in women studies while those in the Southeast were more likely to not have such courses. The frequency of responses for the first part of question 3 are reported in the table below:

	Yes	No	P
Northeast	42	21	.0151
Southeast	41	45	
Midwest	97	46	
Southwest	19	16	
West	21	8	

Inservice Programs

Institutions in the West and Southwest were more likely to provide inservice programs related to multicultural/bilingual education while those in the Southeast and Midwest were more likely to not provide such programs. The following table summarizes the frequency of responses to question 4:

	Yes	No	P
Northeast	27	35	.0002
Southeast	29	59	
Midwest	47	100	
Southwest	25	14	
West	19	11	

Provisions for Bilingual Education

Significant differences were found for four items in question 5

concerned with how multicultural/bilingual education is being addressed within the education unit. Institutions in the West were more likely to have provisions for bilingual education as a component in foundations courses, as a component in methodology courses, as a major emphasis in courses, and as a minor or supplementary. Institutions in the Southeast are the least likely to have provisions for bilingual education in the four areas listed above. Institutions in the Midwest are also more likely to not have provisions for bilingual education as a major emphasis in courses than institutions in the West, Northeast, and Southwest. The frequency of responses and level of significance when $P \leq .05$ for the bilingual education part of question 5 are presented below:

	Northeast		Southeast		Midwest		Southwest		West		P
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	
Component in Foundations	16	51	13	77	27	126	11	29	12	19	.0306
Component in Methodology	20	47	7	83	32	121	11	29	13	18	.0003
Major Emphasis in Courses	13	54	5	85	9	144	9	31	9	22	.0000
Major or Specialization	17	50	2	88	13	140	12	28	12	19	
Minor or Supplementary	8	59	7	83	16	137	10	30	9	22	.0045
Department/ Division	3	64	0	90	12	141	10	30	3	28	

Faculty

On the question of faculty development activities for multicultural/bilingual education (question 9), four significant differences existed. In Institutions in the West and Southwest professional association meetings

were more likely to be used to foster the concept of multicultural education among faculty members than in other regions. Institutions in the Northeast were more likely to not use the professional association meetings as a means than in other regions.

In institutions in the Southwest professional association meetings were more likely to be used to foster the concept of bilingual education among faculty members than in other parts of the country. Institutions in the Southeast were more unlikely to not use this means than those in other regions of the country. For fostering the concept of bilingual education among faculty members, institutions in the West were more likely to use seminars/symposiums than those in other regions. Institutions in the Southwest and West were more likely to use cross-cultural field experiences for this purpose than those in other regions. Institutions in the Southeast were more likely to not use seminars/symposiums and cross-cultural field experiences than those in other regions.

The following table summarizes the frequency of responses for the items in question 9 where significant differences were found on the chi square test:

	Northeast		Southeast		Midwest		Southwest		West		
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	P
Multicultural Ed Professional Association Mtgs.	25	42	39	51	79	74	25	15	19	12	.0399
Bilingual Ed Professional Association Mtgs.	20	47	9	81	42	111	21	19	14	17	.0000
Seminars/ Symposiums	17	50	7	83	21	132	12	28	12	19	.0001
Cross-Cultural Field Experiences	13	54	8	82	21	132	11	29	8	23	.0301

Management

Significant differences were found on three items in question 13 concerning the ways in which the multicultural/bilingual education activities within the education unit are developed and controlled/ monitored. Programs in the West were more likely to be developed by (1) a person responsible for directing/coordinating the multicultural/bilingual efforts and (2) cooperative planning with local education agencies than in other regions. Such programs were also more likely to be controlled/monitored by a person responsible for directing/coordinating the multicultural/bilingual efforts in institutions in the West than in other regions. For each of these three items, the programs were more likely to not be developed or controlled/ monitored by a person who coordinated the program or by cooperative planning with local education agencies in institutions in the Southeast than any other region. The following table reports the data related to the three items that were found to be significant:

	Northeast		Southeast		Midwest		Southwest		West		
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	P
Developed By											
A person responsible for directing/ coordinating the program	17	50	8	82	29	124	15	25	13	18	.0001
Cooperative planning with local education agencies	18	49	10	80	23	130	11	29	11	20	.0044
Controlled/ Monitored By											
A person responsible for directing/ coordinatin the progra	12	55	7	83	30	234	8	32	12	19	.0035

Institutions in the Southwest were more likely to receive financial support for bilingual education programs from the education unit than institutions in any other part of the country. Institutions in the Southeast were more likely to not receive the financial support from the education unit than those in other parts of the country. The frequency of responses for the only item in question 14 for which a significant difference existed are recorded in the following table:

	Yes	No	P
Northeast	23	44	.0002
Southeast	9	81	
Midwest	30	123	
Southwest	16	24	
West	10	21	

Question 15 asked the respondent to indicate the resources utilized by faculty and/or students in the implementation of multicultural/bilingual education programs. There were significant differences between regions in which the institutions are located on four of the resources listed in this question.

Institutions in the West and Southwest were more likely to have a Center for Ethnic Studies, Multicultural Education, and/or Bilingual Education than institutions in the other three regions. Institutions in the Southwest were also more likely to have textbooks related to multicultural/bilingual education and to utilize consultant who are not part of the university faculty. Institutions in the West were more likely to utilize ethnic agencies and organizations than those in other regions. Institutions in the Southeast and Midwest were more likely to not have textbooks related to multicultural/bilingual education than those in other regions. In addition, institutions in the Southeast were more likely to not utilize ethnic agencies and organization or consultants who are not part of the university faculty

than those in other regions. The data for these four items is reported in the following chart:

	Northeast		Southeast		Midwest		Southwest		West		
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	P
Center for Ethnic Studies, etc.	10	57	11	79	15	128	13	27	11	2	.0056
Textbooks	38	29	44	46	75	78	31	9	22	9	.0046
Ethnic Agencies	26	41	16	74	41	112	17	23	17	14	.0003
Consultants	24	43	20	70	50	103	23	17	15	16	.0011

Research and Development

Significant differences were found for three items in this section. Master theses and faculty projects were more likely to be undertaken for research activities in multicultural education in institutions in the West than in any other region. Institutions in the Southeast were more likely not to use master theses and faculty projects for multicultural education research than other areas of the country. The following table shows the items in question 18 for which significant differences existed:

	Northeast		Southeast		Midwest		Southwest		West		
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	P
Multicultural Ed Master Theses	7	60	7	83	15	138	7	33	9	22	.0160
Faculty Projects	11	56	12	78	28	125	13	27	11	20	.0175

For question 19 concerning the types of multicultural/bilingual products produced by faculty members in the education unit, a significant difference was found for one item only. Faculty members in institutions located in the West and Southwest were more likely to make presentations on bilingual education at practitioner-oriented meetings than faculty members from any other region. Faculty from institutions in the Southeast were more likely to not make such presentations than those from other regions. The following table shows the frequency of responses for this one item:

	Yes	No	P
Northeast	13	54	.0004
Southeast	5	85	
Midwest	24	129	
Southwest	13	27	
West	10	21	

General

Significant differences existed for four items in this section of the survey. On question 20 respondents were to indicate the factors which contributed to or deterred the present and future planning, development, and implementation of multicultural/bilingual education. Significant differences were found for two of these items. Institutions in the West were more likely to indicate that the availability of federal funds contributed to the development of multicultural/bilingual programs. Institutions, on the other hand, in the Southeast were more likely to indicate that the availability of federal funds had no influence or was a major deterrent in the development and implementation of such programs.

For the factor, "availability of state funds," differences also existed. Institutions in the West were more likely to indicate that state funds were a contributing factor than any other region. Institutions in the Southeast and Midwest were more likely to indicate that this factor was of no influence. Institutions in the Southwest were more likely to indicate that the availability of state funds was a deterrent in the development of their programs.

The following table summarizes the frequency of responses and level of significance for these two items:

	Availability of Federal Funds			Availability of State Funds		
	Contributing	No Influence	Deterring	Contributing	No Influence	Deterring
Northeast	11	15	19	9	16	21
Southeast	11	30	25	8	27	29
Midwest	25	50	34	18	52	40

Southwest	12	9	13	7	8	16
West	13	8	5	10	6	7

P = .0309 P = .0368

For question 21 on services that AACTE might provide to assist the education unit in planning, developing, and implementing multicultural education programs, significant differences were found for two of the items. Institutions in the West and Southwest were more likely to indicate that AACTE should stimulate research and analysis on various aspects of multicultural education through the convening of task forces than institutions in other regions. Conversely, institutions in the Northeast and Midwest were more likely to not indicate this as a service that AACTE should provide. Institutions in the West were also more likely to indicate that AACTE should catalogue information about funding agencies to disseminate as a directory than those in other regions while institutions in the Midwest were more likely to indicate that this was not necessary as an AACTE service. The frequency of responses for both of these items is shown in the following table:

	Northeast		Southeast		Midwest		Southwest		West		
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	P
Stimulate research and analysis on aspects of multicultural ed	18	49	34	56	43	100	18	22	15	16	.0496
Catalogue information about funding agencies	33	34	57	54	60	103	21	19	18	13	.0051

POPULATION OF CITY IN AREA IN WHICH THE INSTITUTION IS LOCATED

Of the 387 institutions responding to the survey, 13.7 percent were located in cities with a population of over 500,000; 31.0 percent in cities with a population between 50,000 and 499,999; 47.8 percent in cities between 2,500 and 49,999; and 7.2 percent in areas with less than a 2,500 population. For discussion purposes in this section, large urban will be used to describe cities with a population over 500,000; urban to describe cities with population between 50,000 and 499,999; small town to describe cities with a population between 2,500 and 49,999; and rural to describe areas with a population of less than 2,500.

Institutions from different population density areas also differed significantly on some of their responses to items on the survey. Significant differences in responses were found for 24 different items on the questionnaire. These included twelve items in the section on programs; seven items in the section on management; one item in the section on research and development; and four items in the general section. These differences are reported by section in the narrative that follows.

Programs Related to Multicultural Education

Institutions located in a large urban area were more likely to have seven of the fifteen activities listed in question 1 than institutions in other areas. For six of those seven activities where significant differences existed, institutions in small towns were more likely to not have those activities than institutions in urban and rural areas. For the activity, "experiences which prepare education personnel to teach content from a multicultural perspective," institutions in urban areas were more likely to not have that activity than those in other areas. The following table reports the frequency of responses

and level of significance for the seven items for which significant differences were found on the chi square test.

	Large Urban		Urban		Small Town		Rural		
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	P
A student teaching experience in a school with students who are racially/ ethnically different from the student teachers	48	5	99	19	130	50	22	5	.0112
Study of the dynamics of diverse cultures and the implications for developing appropriate teaching strategies	40	13	80	34	100	73	17	11	.0472
Study of linguistic variations and the implications for developing appropriate teaching strategies	31	22	57	51	67	107	13	13	.0248
Study of diverse learning styles related to ethnic/ cultural difference and the implications for developing appropriate teaching strategies	36	15	74	33	84	88	17	11	.0084
Study of specific ethnic groups within the U.S.	34	18	52	55	74	101	13	14	.0351
Experiences which prepare education personnel to work more effectively with minority students	49	4	88	24	128	48	21	4	.0195
Experiences which prepare personnel to teach content from a multicultural perspective	38	15	68	42	83	89	12	13	.0087

Women's Studies

Significant differences were found on question 3 concerning courses and departments related to women's studies. Institutions in large urban areas were more likely to have both courses and departments related to women's studies. Institutions in rural areas were more likely to not have courses in women's studies than institutions in other areas while institutions in small town areas were more likely to not have departments or divisions related to women's studies within the institution. The following table shows the frequency of responses and level of significance for those two items:

	Large Urban		Urban		Small Town		Rural		
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	P
Courses	37	14	70	40	107	65	10	18	.0131
Department/ Division	13	26	19	75	18	133	4	21	.0154

Inservice Programs

Institutions in large urban areas were also more likely to provide inservice programs in multicultural/bilingual education with a local education agency, teacher center or other agency than institutions in other areas. Institutions in rural areas were more likely to not provide such inservice programs than institutions in other areas. The data for this question is presented in the following table:

	Large Urban		Urban		Small Town		Rural		
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	P
Inservice Programs in Multicultural/ Bilingual Education	31	20	45	69	65	112	9	19	.0140

Provisions for Multicultural Education

Institutions in urban and small town areas were more likely to provide for multicultural education in the teacher education curriculum as a major emphasis in courses than institutions in large urban or rural areas. Institutions in rural areas were more likely to not have such provisions than those in the large urban, urban, and small town areas. The data for this item from question 5 is found in the following table:

	Large Urban		Urban		Small Town		Rural		
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	P
Major Emphasis in Courses	17	36	24	96	24	161	6	22	.0140

Provisions for Bilingual Education

Institutions in small town areas were more likely to provide for bilingual education in the teacher education program as a major or specialization than institutions in other areas. Institutions in rural areas were more likely to not provide for a major or specialization in bilingual education than those in other population areas. This data is reported in the following chart:

	Large Urban		Urban		Small Town		Rural		
Bilingual Education	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	P
Major or Specilization	15	38	16	104	20	165	2	23	.0144

Management

A significant difference was found for one item on question 14 concerning the financial support for multicultural/bilingual education programs.

For bilingual education programs institutions in small town areas were more likely to receive financial support from the education unit itself than institutions in other areas. Institutions in rural areas were more likely to not receive such support than institutions in other areas. This data is reported in the following table:

Bilingual Education	Large Urban Yes	Large Urban No	Urban Yes	Urban No	Small Town Yes	Small Town No	Rural Yes	Rural No	P
Education Unit	21	32	26	94	36	149	5	23	.0172

Institutions from large urban areas were also more likely to have specific resources that could be utilized by faculty and/or students in the implementation of multicultural/bilingual education programs. This was true for six of the eight items listed as question 15 on the survey. Institutions in rural areas were more likely to not have as resources consultants who are not part of the university faculty or cooperative programs with public or private schools that have a multicultural student population than other institutions. For the other four items institutions in small town areas were more likely to not have those resources than institutions in other areas. The following table shows the frequency of responses for the six items for which significant differences were found:

	Large Urban Yes	Large Urban No	Urban Yes	Urban No	Small Town Yes	Small Town No	Rural Yes	Rural No	P
Center for Ethnic Studies/Multi-cultural/Bilingual Ed	17	36	23	97	23	162	7	21	.0075
Ethnic agencies/ organizations	23	30	42	78	45	140	8	20	.0340
Consultants	25	28	44	76	58	127	5	23	.0406
Cooperative programs with public or private schools that have a multicultural student population	26	27	47	73	49	136	6	22	.0038

Cooperative programs with public or private schools that have a student population with different ethnic backgrounds than the majority of students in the teacher ed program	25	28	43	77	47	138	8	20	.0163
Student experiences in cultural settings different than that of the teacher education student	26	27	59	61	64	121	13	15	.0459

Research and Development

A significant difference existed for only one item in the section on research and development. Faculty members of institutions in urban areas were more likely to conduct research of instructional processes for multicultural education than faculty in any other institutions. Faculty of institutions in rural areas are more likely to not conduct such research than institutions in other areas. The following chart shows the frequency of responses and level of significance for this one item:

	Large Urban		Urban		Small town		Rural		
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	P
Multicultural Education Research of Instructional Processes	10	43	17	103	14	171	6	22	.0354

General

Question 20 asked the respondent to indicate factors that contributed to or deterred the present and future planning, development, and implementation of multicultural/bilingual programs in the education unit. A significant difference existed on one of the items. Institutions in large urban areas were more likely to view "faculty qualified to teach multicultural/bilingual education" as a contributing factor than institutions in other areas.

Institutions in rural areas were more likely to view qualified faculty as having no influence or as a deterring factor than institutions in other areas. Institutions in urban and small town areas viewed qualified faculty almost equally as with contributing to or deterring the development and implementation of multicultural/bilingual education programs. The frequency data for this item is presented in the table below:

	Contributing Factor	No Influence	Deterring Factor	P
Large Urban	32	5	8	.0029
Urban	43	14	41	
Small Town	59	24	65	
Rural	6	7	9	

A significant difference existed for one item on question 21 concerning the types of services that institutions would like to see AACTE provide to assist the education unit in planning, developing, and implementing multicultural education programs. Institutions in rural areas were more likely to feel that AACTE should catalogue information about funding agencies to disseminate as a directory than institutions in any other area. Institutions in small town areas were more likely to <u>not</u> feel that AACTE should provide that specific service. The data for this question is presented in the following table:

	Large Urban		Urban		Small Town		Rural		
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	P
Catalogue information about funding agencies to disseminate as a directory	27	26	59	61	69	116	17	11	.0319

SIZE OF INSTITUTION

Institutions responding to the survey ranged in size from 327 to 50,095 students. For purposes of analyzing this data, the institutions were divided by size of student population into four quartiles. The first quartile included institutions with a student population from 327 to 1,366; the second quartile included institutions with 1,367 to 3,609 students; the third quartile included institutions with 3,610 to 9,905 students; and the fourth quartile included institutions with 9,906 to 55,000 students.

More differences were found using the chi square test for size of the institution than for any of the other variables for which the null hypotheses were being tested. Significant differences existed for 47 different items on the questionnaire. These included sixteen items in the section on programs; six items in the section on faculty; fifteen items in the section on management; two items in the section on research and development; and eight items in the general section. These differences are described in this section.

Programs Related to Multicultural Education

The education units of large institutions (fourth quartile) were more likely to have activities related to multicultural education than institutions of other sizes. Of the fifteen activities listed in question, significant differences were found for eight of those. In all cases the large institutions were more likely to have the eight activities while the small (first quartile) institutions were more likely to not have the activities. The following table shows the frequency of responses and level of significance for the eight items for which significant differences existed:

	(Small) 1st Quartile		2nd Quartile		3rd Quartile		(Large) 4th Quartile		
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	P
A student teaching experience in a school with students who are racially/ ethnically different from the student teachers	58	30	79	18	80	18	81	13	.0096
Study of the dynamics of diverse cultures and the implications for developing appropriate teaching strategies	44	43	64	26	55	42	72	20	.0004
Study of linguistic variations and the implications for developing appropriate teaching strategies	29	58	34	50	39	56	64	29	.0000
Study of diverse learning styles related to ethnic/ cultural difference and the implications for developing appropriate teaching strategies	39	45	51	34	56	41	68	22	.0033
Study of cultures and ethnicity of those groups within the geographical region served by the education unit	41	47	59	30	56	39	66	28	.0154
Study of specific ethnic groups within the U.S.	31	56	46	44	44	50	52	37	.0475
Experiences which prepare education personnel to work more effectively with minority students	58	29	77	15	71	23	79	12	.0084

Experiences which prepare education personnel to teach content from a multicultural perspective	26	60	57	33	56	38	61	27	.0000

Ethnic Studies

Larger institutions from both the third and fourth quartiles were more likely to have courses and departments/divisions related to U.S. ethnic groups than the smaller institutions. Institutions in the first quartile were more likely to not have ethnic studies than other institutions. This data is reported in the following table:

	(Small) 1st Quartile		2nd Quartile		3rd Quartile		(Large) 4th Quartile		
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	P
Courses and/or departments/ divisions related to U.S. ethnic groups	50	39	75	21	84	11	82	12	.0000

Women's Studies

The larger institutions, fourth quartile, were also more likely to have both courses and departments/divisions related to women's studies than the other institutions. The small institutions, first quartile, were more likely to not have provisions for women's studies than other institutions. This data is reported in the following table:

	(Small) 1st Quartile		2nd Quartile		3rd Quartile		(Large) 4th Quartile		
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	P
Courses	41	45	48	45	64	29	70	18	.0000
Department/ Division	5	64	10	77	12	62	25	53	.0001

Inservice Programs

Again the largest institutions were more likely to provide inservice programs in multicultural/bilingual education than institutions of other sizes. The smallest institutions were more likely to not have such provisions than institutions of other sizes. The following table shows the frequency of responses for question 4:

	(Small) 1st Quartile		2nd Quartile		3rd Quartile		(Large) 4th Quartile		
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	P
Inservice Programs in Multicultural/ Bilingual Education	16	74	26	66	43	52	64	28	.0000

Provisions for Multicultural Education

The largest institutions were more likely to offer a major or specil in multicultural education than other institutions while the smallest institutions were more likely to not offer such. This data is reported in the following table:

	(Small) 1st Quartile		2nd Quartile		3rd Quartile		(Large) 4th Quartile		
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	P
Major or Specialization Offered	5	89	7	90	8	90	19	77	.0078

Provisions for Bilingual Education

The largest institutions were more likely to provide for bilingual education as a component in methodology courses while institutions in the second quartile were more likely to not have this provision than other institutions. The larger institutions were also more likely to provide for bilingual education as a major or specialization and a minor or supplementary than other institutions. Institutions in the first quartile, on the other hand, were more likely to not have such provisions. The frequency of responses for these three items in question 5 are reported in the table below:

	(Small) 1st Quartile		2nd Quartile		3rd Quartile		(Large) 4th Quartile		
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	P
Component in Methodology Courses	16	78	14	83	23	75	31	65	.0208
Major or Specialization Offered	5	89	9	88	13	85	29	67	.0000
Minor or Supplementary Offered	5	89	10	87	11	87	24	72	.0010

Faculty

The larger institutions were more likely to encourage faculty to learn about the concept of multicultural/bilingual education through various activities than the smaller institutions. Specifically, the largest institutions, fourth quartile, were more likely to use faculty research grants for multicultural education. For bilingual education, they were also more likely to use professional association meetings and seminars/symposiums to foster the concept among faculty members. Institutions in the third quartile were more likely to use inservice training for faculty in the area of multicultural education and cross-cultural field experiences in the area of bilingual education. The larger instituion, third and fourth quartile, were also more likely to indicate that the faculty was on their own with respect to multicultural/bilingual education. Institutions in the second quartile were more likely to not indicate that the faculty was on their own with respect to multicultural/bilingual education than institutions of other sizes. The smalles institutions were more likely to not indicate that the other five activites were utilized to foster the concept of multicultural/bilingual education among faculty members. The data for the items with significant differences on question 9 are shown in the following table:

	(Small) 1st Quartile		2nd Quartile		3rd quartile		(Large) 4th Quartile		
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	P
Multicultural Education									

Inservice Training for Faculty	12	82	16	81	19	79	17	79	.0226
Faculty Research Grants	5	89	6	91	15	83	21	75	.0019
Bilingual Education									
Professional Association Mtg.	17	77	21	76	31	67	38	58	.0061
Seminars/Symposiums	8	86	12	85	21	77	29	67	.0009
Cross-Cultural Field Experiences	7	87	11	86	23	75	20	76	.0016
Faculty is on their Own with Respect to Multicultural/ Bilingual Education	24	70	17	80	36	62	34	62	.0146

Management

Question 13 asked the respondent to indicate how the multicultural/ bilingual education programs in the education unit are developed and controlled/monitored. Significant differences were found for five of the items in this question. Respondents from the largest institutions were more likely to indicate that the Multicultural education programs were developed by a person responsible for directing/coordinating the multicultural/bilingual education program, by each department/program within the education unit having the prerogative to develop its own multicultural education programs, and by cooperative planning with local education agencies than institutions of other sizes. The smallest institutions were more likely to not indicate these means for developing multicultural/bilingual education programs.

The larger institutions were also more likely to utilize an institution-wide curriculum committee and a person responsible for directing/coordinating the multicultural/bilingual education program to control and monitor the multicultural/bilingual education programs in the education unit. Institutions in the third quartile were more likely to not use the person responsible for directing/coordinating the multicultural/bilingual education programs to

control and monitor those programs. The smallest institutions were more likely to not have those programs controlled or monitored by an institution-wide curriculum committee. The data for the items in question 13 where significant differences existed is reported in the following table:

	(Small) 1st Quartile		2nd Quartile		3rd Quartile		(Large) 4th Quartile		
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	P
Developed By									
A person responsible for directing/coordinating the multicultural/bilingual efforts	12	82	17	80	19	79	35	61	.0008
Each Department/Program within the education unit having the prerogative to develop, control, and monitor its own multicultural programs	24	70	29	68	43	55	46	50	.0014
Cooperative planning with local education agencies	5	89	10	87	25	73	34	62	.0000
Controlled/Monitored By									
A College or Institution-wide Curriculum Committee	7	87	15	82	19	79	26	70	.0056
A Person Responsible for Directing/Coordinating the Multicultural/Bilingual Ed	15	79	14	83	12	86	29	67	.0096

Respondents were asked to indicate from where the financial support for the multicultural/bilingual education programs comes in question 14. The largest institutions were more likely to indicate that the support came from

the education unit for both multicultural and bilingual education programs than institutions of other sizes. The smallest institutions were more likely to not indicate the education unit as a source of support than other institutions. The frequency of responses for this item and the level of significance are reported below:

	(Small) 1st Quartile		2nd Quartile		3rd Quartile		(Large) 4th Quartile		
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	P
Multicultural Education									
Education Unit	26	68	35	62	44	54	58	38	.0000
Bilingual Education									
Education Unit	8	86	16	81	20	78	43	53	.0000

Significant differences existed for all eight of the resources that might be utilized by faculty and/or students in the implementation of multicultural/bilingual education program listed in question 15. The larger institutions, third and fourth quartile, were more likely to use these eight resources than the smaller institutions. Institutions in the third quartile were more likely to use student experiences in cultural settings different than that of the teacher education student and community-based programs as some phase of the student's work. For the other six items, the institutions in the fourth quartile were more likely to indicate their utilization. Institutions in the first quartile were more likely to not utilize all eight of the resources listed. This data is presented in the following table:

	(Small) 1st Quartile		2nd Quartile		3rd Quartile		(Large) 4th Quartile		
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	P
Center for Ethnic Studies, etc.	7	87	11	86	20	78	32	64	.0000

Textbooks	32	62	51	46	61	37	67	29	.0000
Ethnic Agencies/ Organizations	18	76	26	71	32	66	40	56	.0022
Consultants	22	72	29	68	39	59	41	55	.0349
Cooperative Programs with Public Schools with multicultural Student Population	16	78	30	67	34	64	46	50	.0001
Cooperative Programs with public or private schools with student population with different ethnic backgrounds than majority of students in teacher ed program	16	78	26	71	35	63	45	51	.0000
Student experiences in cultural settings different than that of teacher education student	30	64	36	61	53	45	42	54	.0086
Community-Based Program as some phase of the student's work	18	76	28	69	39	59	33	63	.0288

Research and Development

Significant differences were found for only two items in this section. The largest institutions were more likely to report that the research activities related to multicultural education were supported by the college or university than institutions of other sizes. The institutions in the first quartile were more likely to not report the college or university as providing the support for research activities in multicultural education. The frequency of responses for this item in question 18b. is reported below:

	(Small) 1st Quartile		2nd Quartile		3rd Quartile		(Large) 4th Quartile		
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	P
Multicultural Education Support from the college or university	6	88	8	89	23	75	35	61	.0000

The second item for which a significant difference was found was in question 19 about the products related to multicultural/bilingual education produced by faculty members of the education unit. Faculty in the largest institutions were more likely to make presentations related to multicultural education at practitioner-oriented meetings than faculty from institutions of other sizes. Faculty in the smallest institutions were more likely to not make such presentations than those in larger institutions. This data is reported in the following table:

	(Small) 1st Quartile		2nd Quartile		3rd Quartile		(Large) 4th Quartile		
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	P
Multicultural Education Presentations at Practitioner-Oriented Meetings	6	88	26	71	28	70	38	58	.0000

General

Significant differences were found for eight of the ten items listed in question 21. about services that AACTE might provide to assist the education unit in planning, developing, and implementing multicultural education programs. The larger institutions were more likely to feel that AACTE should provide the services than the smaller institutions. Specifically, institutions in the third quartile were more likely to feel that AACTE should (1) facilitate

the dissemination of information about operationally and programmatically successful multicultural education programs; (2) maintain a consultative service on multicultural teacher education that can match expertise to needs at all levels; and (3) convene national or regional meetings on multicultural education. Institutions in the fourth quartile were more likely to indicate that AACTE should provide the other five services. Institutions in the second quartile were more likely to not indicate that AACTE should facilitate the dissemination of information about operationally and programmatically successful multicultural programs. Institutions in both the first and second quartile were more likely to not indicate that AACTE should convene national or regional meetings on multicultural education than the larger institutions. The institutions in the first quartile were more likely to not indicate that AACTE should provide the other six services than institutions of other sizes. The frequency of responses and level of significance for the items in question 21 are presented below:

	(Small) 1st Quartile		2nd Quartile		3rd Quartile		(Large) 4th Quartile		
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	P
Stimulate research & analysis on various aspects of multicultural education through the convening of task forces	16	78	22	75	41	57	48	48	.0000
Provide consultation on development of proposals & research designs for submission to federal agencies	20	74	28	69	38	60	39	57	.0054

Catalogue information about funding agencies to disseminate	28	66	41	56	49	49	52	44	.0034
Facilitate the dissemination of information about operationally and programmatically successful multicultural programs	48	46	44	53	64	34	61	35	.0134
Maintain consultative service on multicultural teacher education that can match expertise to needs at all levels	23	71	33	64	45	53	41	55	.0052
Convene national or regional meetings on multicultural ed	28	66	29	68	48	50	42	54	.0049
Provide a clearinghouse for information, research & analytical studies	36	58	47	50	55	43	57	39	.0176
Conduct research & analytical studies	14	80	24	73	34	64	34	62	.0010

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY

During the fall of 1977, AACTE asked its 786 member institutions to respond to the "Survey of Multicultural Education in Teacher Education." The data collected from this survey was used to compile a state-of-the-scene report about how multicultural education was currently being addressed by teacher education institutions. This would allow the examination of where institutions now are in the implementation of multicultural education and where the recently revised "Standards for the Accreditation of Teacher Education," of NCATE suggest that they should be.

Only 49.25 percent of the institutions responded to the survey. The data presented, thus, can be used only to report the state-of-the-scene for the responding institutions and not to generalize to American teacher education. This section will summarize the data in three sections: (1) Descriptive Profile of the Responding Institutions; (2) Descriptive Profile of Institutions with Provisions for Multicultural/Bilingual Education; and (3) Multicultural Education as Addressed by Different Institutions.

DESCRIPTIVE PROFILE OF THE RESPONDING INSTITUTIONS

Over half of the 387 responding institutions indicated that they have as a part of their education programs various activities that are supportive of the multicultural education concept as described in NCATE's Standard 2.1.1 Multicultural Education. Specific activities for which education units have provisions include the study of or experiences for (1) intergroup communications; (2) student teaching in schools with students who are racially/ethnically different from the student teachers; (3) working more effectively with minority students; (4) values clarification; (5) dynamics of diverse cultures and the implications for developing appropriate teaching strategies; (6) cultures and ethnicity of groups within the geographical

region served by the education unit; (7) diverse learning styles related to ethnic/cultural differences and the implications for developing appropriate teaching strategies; (8) teaching content from a multicultural perspective; and (9) racism.

Over one-third of these institutions have departments or divisions which focus on U.S. Ethnic groups (e.g., Black Studies, Native American Studies). Over 75 percent offer courses related to specific U.S. ethnic groups. 59.4 percent have courses on Afro Americans; 31.0 percent on American Indians or Eskimos; 28.6 percent on Asian or Pacific Islanders; 27.5 percent on Hispanic Americans; 15.1 percent on Eastern European Americans; 9.6 percent on Western European Americans; and 6.4 percent on Jewish Americans. 6.7 percent of the institutions listed courses in ethnic studies and 6.2 percent listed courses about foreign cultures or with an international focus. 22.5 percent of these institutions require that students complete at least one course related to specific U.S. ethnic groups prior to the completion of their education degree program.

Over half (58.1 %) of the institutions offer courses related to women's studies. 13.7 percent have departments or divisions of women's studies in their institutions. Nine percent of the institutions require students to complete at least one course in this area prior to the completion of the education degree program.

Almost forty percent (38.8 %) of the institutions offer inservice programs in the area of multicultural and/or bilingual education. These are most often offered to teachers and administrators in cooperation with a local education agency or teacher center.

305 institutions (78.8 %) reported having some provision for addressing multicultural and/or bilingual education within the education unt. Most often multicultural/bilingual education is addressed as a component in foundations courses (by 58.9 % of the institutions) or as a component

in methodology courses (by 49.4 % of the institutions). Less than 25 percent of the institutions provide for either multicultural or bilingual education as the major focus or emphasis in a course. 25 percent offer a major or specialization in multicultural education; 18.6 percent offer a major or specialization in bilingual education. 15 percent of the institutions offer a minor or supplementary in multicultural education while 17.8 percent offer the minor or supplementary in bilingual education. 10.1 percent of the institutions have a separate department or division within the education unit for multicultural/bilingual education.

Institutions do not appear to be very diverse in the ethnic/racial make-up of the faculty. Over 87 percent of the institutions have at least one white faculty member in the education unt; over 28 percent have at least one black faculty member; over 15 percent have at least one Hispanic faculty member; and only six percent have American Indian or Eskimo faculty members. Almost 90 percent (89.78 %) of the full-time teacher education faculty are white; 6.94 percent are black; 1.74 percent are Hispanic; 1.19 percent are Asian American; and .35 percent are American Indian or Eskimo. Of the full-time education faculty, 32.27 percent are female and 67.73 percent male. At the part-time level the number of females increases to 48.66 percent of the part-time faculty for the education unit.

The concept of multicultural/bilingual education has been fostered among faculty members through various activities. Almost half of the respondents indicated, however, that the faculty is on their own with respect to this. The most frequent means was through professional association meetings (53.0 % of the responding institutions). Faculty development activities are not generally organized or structured for multicultural/bilingual education. Less than one-third reported seminars, cross-cultural field experiences, inservice training, faculty research grants, or sabbaticals as being used for this purpose.

The student population at the responding institutions appears to be extremely diverse in ethnic/racial composition. Over 99 percent of the institutions have white students; 96 percent have at least one black student; 77 percent have at least one Hispanic student; 75 percent have at least one Asian American student; and 62 percent have one or more American Indian or Eskimo student. For the student population at the institution level, 88.44 percent of the total student population of the responding institutions are white; 7.65 percent are black; 2.37 percent are Hispanic; 1.05 percent are Asian American; and .49 percent are American Indian or Eskimo. The percentage of minority students is slightly higher in undergraduage education for black and American Indian students than for the total institution. The percentage of minority students in graduate education, however, is less than at the undergraduate level or for the total institution. Almost half (47.57 %) of the total student population is female. For both undergraduate and graduate education, however, the percentage of females increases to 58.62 percent and 56.62 percent respectively.

Just over one-third of the institutions (35.9%) reported research activities related to multicultural/bilingual education being undertaken in the education unit. Most of the research activity undertaken is through faculty projects. Some research in this area is also done as master theses, sponsored research, doctoral dissertations and special institutes. More research related to multicultural education is being undertaken than for bilingual education. Over half of the respondents that indicated research in multicultural education reported that the research is in the area of instructional processes, social/cultural processes, interethnic attitudes, and acculturaltion/assimilation/cultural pluralism. Of institutions with research in bilingual education, 93 percent reported research of instructional processes. Over half reported bilingual research of social/cultural processes and acculturation/assimilation/cultural pluralism. Ethnographic research and research of culturally biased tests are also being

conducted for both multicultural and bilingual education. The major support for research activities for both multicultural and bilingual education is the institution itself. The U.S. Office of Education provides support for research activities in 24.3 percent of the institutions with multicultural education research and in 35.7 percent of those with bilingual education reserach. Private foundations, State Education Agencies, local education agencies, and the National Institute of Education provide support in less than twelve percent of the institutions.

Over one-third of the institutions (36.2%) indicated that faculty in the education unit produce products in the area of multicultural education while 22.7 percent indicated that faculty produce products in the area of bilingual education. These products are most often in the form of a presentation at practitioner-oriented meetings. Less than half reported that these were educational products for local or regional dissemination or publications in books or journals.

Factors that contributed to the planning, development, and implementation of multicultural/bilingual education included in 25 to 40 percent of the institutions university/college administration, various ethnic groups, qualified faculty, state education agency guidelines and regulations, professional associations, state legislation, and federal legislation. The availability of funds from the university, state, and federal agencies was considered as deterrent to the development and implementation of multicultural education by 25 to 41 percent of the institutions.

Over half of the institutions indicated that AACTE should provide three services related to multicultural/bilingual education. These included (1) publish a journal or bulletin that informs teacher educators of new ideas, approaches, or materials in multicultural education; (2) facilitate the dissemination of information about operationally and programmatically successful multicultural education programs; and (3) provide a clearinghouse

for informational, research and analytical studies of multicultural education.

The written comments of the respondents concerning the future of multicultural/bilingual education at their institution suggest positive support generally for multicultural education. State legislation and certification requirements as well as the NCATE standards have increased the planning and probable implementation of such programs. The lack of money and qualified or interested staff are clearly the greatest drawback to immediate development of programs that might be viewed as appropriate and desirable. The most common reasons provided for not planning programs were that the student population does not include minorities, graduates will not teach in areas where there are many minorities, and there are not opportunities for preservice teachers to experience multicultural situations. Comments concerning reasons and goals of multicultural education would suggest that efforts need to be made to clarify the concept. The majority of institutions either have programs in multicultural/bilingual education or are planning such programs, and yet comments suggest a need for model programs from which they could implement components that are most appropriate to their own situations.

DESCRIPTIVE PROFILE OF INSTITUTIONS WITH PROVISIONS FOR MULTICULTURAL/ BILINGUAL EDUCATION

As previously indicated, 78.8 percent of all institutions responding to this survey indicated that they have some provision for multicultural and/or bilingual education within their education unit. This section examinies in greater detail only the programs of those 305 institutions with such provisions.

Over 75 percent of these institutions have courses in ethnic studies offered at their institution, not necessarily within the education unit itself. 23.9 percent of these institutions require at least one course in ethnic studies for the completion of the education degree program. 63 percent of

these institutions offer courses in women's studies while 43.9 percent provide inservice programs in multicultural/bilingual education in cooperation usually with local education agencies or teacher centers.

Respondents were asked to list the courses in multicultural and bilingual education offered at different degree levels. 76.4 percent offer courses with a component in multicultural education of a specific focus related to multicultural education at the undergraduate level. 16.7 percent offer such courses as dual level courses and 25.6 percent offer these courses at the graduate level. The focus of these courses can be classified in five general areas: general studies which includes anthropology, sociology, etc.; international programs; ethnic/cultural studies of U.S. ethnic groups; general education courses; and methodology courses for various disciplines. 68.9% of these institutions require at least one of these courses for completion of the education degree program.

Over thirty percent (31.9%) of these institutions listed courses related to bilingual education at the undergraduate level. 26.0 percent offer such courses as dual level and 9.5 percent offer them as graduate courses. The focus of the bilingual courses can also be classified into five general areas: general studies which includes anthropology, linguistics, etc; international programs; ethnic/language studies of U.S. groups; general education courses; and methodology courses for the various disciplines. Spanish is the major target language for these bilingual education programs. 38.7 percent of the institutions listed Spanish as the target language. Between 5 and 10 percent listed American Indian languages, French, and/or German as the target languages; each of the other languages were listed by less than three percent of the institutions.

The academic background of split-time faculty members who teach the multicultural/bilingual education related courses varies. Most often (around 50%) the faculty members represent either sociology or foreign language

disciplines. Over 25 percent of the institutions indicated that these faculty represent history, anthropology, psychology, English, or Afro-American Studies. Full-time education faculty members who taught these courses were most often from the program areas of elementary education (69.7%) or secondary education (60.7%). Over 25 percent of these institutions indicated that the faculty members were from the program areas of sociological foundations/history/philosophy, early childhood education, curriculum and instruction, social studies education, educational psychology, language arts/reading/ special education, or junior high/middle school education.

The majority of the faculty teaching the multicultural/bilingual courses are full-time faculty in the education unit itself. The percentage of minorities teaching multicultural courses increases considerably over the percentage teaching in the education unit generally with 57.88 percent white, 33.41 black; 3.88 Hispanic; 3.44 Asian American, and 1.28 American Indian or Eskimo. The percentage of women teaching courses related to multicultural education also increases to 36.48 percent.

The percentage of minority faculty teaching bilingual education courses also is much greater than in the teacher education program with 58.88 percent white, 2.76 percent black, 32.01 Hispanic, 4.73 Asian American, and 1.58 percent American Indian or Eskimo. The percentage of females teaching bilingual education courses at the full-time level also increases to 53.73 percent.

Almost half (47.2%) of these institutions indicated that the multicultural/bilingual education programs are developed by each department/program area within the education unit using its own prerogative; this is also the means most often used (31.8%) to control and monitor these programs. The person responsible for coordinating the multicultural/bilingual programs was indicated as developing and monitoring the program by around 25 percent of the institutions. Institution-wide curriculum committees had this responsibility in about 23 percent of the institutions. Almost 25 percent indicated that such

programs were developed by cooperative planning with local education agencies.

The major financial support for both multicultural and bilingual education programs comes from the education unit itself. Other sources of support were listed by less than 17 percent of the institutions.

Using a chi square test, significant differences between institutions with and without provisions for multicultural/bilingual education were determined. Institutions with provisions were more likely to have all of the activities related to multicultural education listed in question 1 except for the "study of foreign cultures." Institutions with provisions were also more likely to have courses and departments/divisions in ethnic studies, courses in women's studies, and inservice programs for multicultural/bilingual education.

Institutions with provisions were more likely to foster the concept of multicultural/bilingual education among faculty members through professional association meeting, seminars or symposiums, and cross-cultural field experiences. For multicultural education, they were more likely also to provide inservice training for the faculty as a mean of fostering the concept of multicultural education.

In the area of research and development significant differences were found on only five of the seventy variables. There appears to be little differences in the research activities for multicultural or bilingual education undertaken in institutions with or without provisions for multicultural/bilingual education.

Institutions with provisions, however, were more likely to specify four factors which contributed to the planning, development, and implementation of their programs. These factors included faculty qualified to teacher programs, state education agency guidelines and/or regulations for multicultural or bilingual education, state legislation related to multicultural or bilingual education, and the support of the university/college administration. Institutions with provisions were also more likely to feel that AACTE should provide

several services that would aid them in planning, developing, and implementing multicultural education programs.

The percentage of minority faculty members was higher at institutions with provisions than those without provisions. Ther percentage of minority faculty in institutions with provisions was 10.79 percent of the full-time education faculty; 12.75 percent of the split-time faculty; and 10.21 of the part-time faculty. For institutions without such provisions the percentage of minority faculty was 6.30 percent of the full-time education faculty; 6.20 percent of the split-time faculty; and 5.40 of the part-time faculty. The percentage of females in institutions with provisions was slightly higher at the full-time and part-time faculty levels and lower at the split-time level. At the full-time level, females composed 32.48 percent of the faculty in institutions with provisions and 31.3 percent in institutions without. At the split-time level, females made up 29.04 percent in institution with provisions and 32.79 percent in institutions without. At the part-time level females made up 49.06 percent in institutions with provisions and 45.38 percent in institutions without provisions.

The percentage of minority students at an institution is higher at institutions with provisions for multicultural/bilingual education, with 11.71 percent compared to 10.30 percent at institutions without provisions. In both undergraduate and graduate education, however, the percentage of minority students is slightly higher at institutions without provisions. The percentage of black students at institutions without provisions is higher than institutions with provisions while the percentage of the other minority students is higher at institutions with provisions than those without provisions. For undergraduate education, minority student enrollment at institutions with provisions is 12.03 percent; at institutions without provisions it is 13.55 percent. At the graduate level minority students make up 10.93 percent of the students in institutions with provisions and 11.93 percent in institutions without provisions. The percentage of females is higher for institutions

without provisions at the total institutional level and in graduate education. 47.31 percent of the student population at institutions with provisions is female and 49.49 percent at institutions without provisions. At the undergraduate education level 59.22 percent are female in institutions with provisions and 53.22 percent in institutions without provisions. At the graduate level the precentage of females in institutions with provisions is 56.06 and 65.12 in institutions without provisions.

The major differences between institutions with provisions for multicultural/bilingual education and those without such provisions are in two areas. First, the programmatic activities and required experiences differ in that institutions with provisions already claim to have provisions for multicultural education that are somewhat consistent with those suggested by the NCATE standards for multicultural education in teacher education curricula. The second difference is the number of minority faculty in education units with provisions. At the full-time, split-time and part-time levels, institutions with such provisions have a considerably greater number of faculty members who are from minority backgrounds than institutions without provisions.

MULTICULTURAL EDUCATION AS ADDRESSED BY DIFFERENT INSTITUTIONS

Using the chi square test, significant differences were found on the way institutions responded to different variables on the questionnaire. The following five null hypotheses were tested:

1. There will be no difference between public and private institutions on their responses to the questions in the "Survey of Multicultural Education in Teacher Education."

2. There will be no difference between NCATE accredited and non-NCATE accredited institutions on their responses to their responses to the questions in the "Survey of Multicultural Education in Teacher Education."

3. There will no difference in the responses of institutions based on the geographical region of the U.S. in which they are located.

4. There will be no difference in the responses of institutions based on the population of the city or area in which they are located.

5. There will be no difference in the responses of institutions based

on the size of the student population for the institution.

Each of the five null hypotheses were rejected for one or more of the 202 variables tested from the questionnaire. These differences are summarized below.

PRIVATE AND PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS

Of the 387 institutions responding to the survey, 51.4 percent were public institutions and 46.6 percent private.

Public institutions were more likely than private institutions to have provisions, activities and experiences in their education units for multicultural and/or bilingual education as listed in question 1. Of the fifteen activities listed, public institutions were more likely to have six of them. Public institutions were also more likely to offer courses or have departments/divisions in both ethnic studies and women's studies. Public institutions were also more likely to offer inservice programs in multicultural/bilingual education than private institutions. Significant differences did not exist in the way that the two types of institutions provided for multicultural education, but there were differences in the provisions for bilingual education. Public institutions were more likely to provide for bilingual education as a component in foundations courses, a major emphasis in courses, as a major or specialization, and as a minor or supplementary. Public institutions were also more likely to have a department or division in the education unit for bilingual education.

In the area of faculty development public institutions were more likely to have provisions for faculty research grants for both multicultural and bilingual education projects than private institutions.

Public institutions were more likely to develop their multicultural/bilingual education programs through individual departments and cooperative planning with the local education agencies than private institutions. These programs were more likely to be controlled and monitored by a college or

institution-wide curriculum committee in public institutions than in private institutions. The source of funding for the multicultural programs in public institutions was more likely to come from the education unit itself. For bilingual education the source of funding in public institutions was more likely to be the education unit or the U.S. Office of Education than in private institutions. Public institutions were also more likely to have resources for multicultural/bilingual education than private institutions. Specifically, the resources that they were more likely to use included a center for ethnic studies/multicultural education/bilingual education, textbooks, ethnic agencies/or organizations, and cooperative programs with public or private schools with a multicultural student population.

Pulbic institutions were more likely to engage in research activities related to multicultural and bilingual education as master theses, doctoral dissertations, faculty projects and sponsored research. The nature of the research was more likely to be research of instructional processes for both multicultural and bilingual education and research on social/cultural processes and culturally-based tests and measurement instruments in the area of multicultural education. For both bilingual and multicultural education research the financial source of support was more likely to be the college or university itself at public institutions as compared with private institutions. Faculty members of public institutions were also more likely to produce products related to both multicultural and bilingual eudcation than faculty in private institutions.

Public institutions were more likely to view the availability of federal funds and state funds as contributing factors in the development and implementation of multicultural/bilingual education programs than private institutions. Finally, public institutions were more likely to feel that AACTE should provide various services to institutions to assist in the planning, developing, and implementing of multicultural education programs.

NCATE ACCREDITED AND NON-NCATE ACCREDITED INSTITUTIONS

Based on NCATE's 1976-77 Annual List, 70.5 percent of the responding institutions were NCATE accredited while 29.5 percent were not NCATE accredited.

Although the null hypothesis was rejected, there were fewer differences based on the accreditation status of the institution than other characteristics. For all variables when significant differences were found, the accredited institutions were more likely to provide the activity or service than the non-accredited institutions.

Accredited institutions were more likely to have provisions for five of the activities related to multicultural education listed in question 1. Accredited institutions were more likely to have courses and departments/divisions in ethnic studies and courses in women's studies than non-accredited institutions. There were no significant differences in the way the two types of institutions provided for multicultural education. Accredited institutions, however, were more likely to address bilingual education as a major emphasis in courses than non-accredited institutions.

In the area of faculty development accredited institutions were more likely to provide for faculty research grants for multicultural/and bilingual education projects. Multicultural education was more likely to be fostered through professional association meetings in accredited institutions.

The multicultural/bilingual education programs in accredited institutions were more likely to be developed by individual departments than in non-accredited institutions. Accredited institutions were also more likely to have resources for multicultural/bilingual education than non-accredited institutions. Specifically, they were more likely to use textbooks, consultants, cooperative programs with schools with a student population of different ethnic backgrounds than the majority of preservice teachers, and student experiences in cultural settings different than that of the teacher education student.

Accredited institutions were more likely to engage in research activities

related to multicultural/bilingual education on only one variable. They were more likely to have faculty projects in the area of bilingual education. The research activities in accredited institutions were more likely to be supported by the college or university than in non-accredited institutions. Faculty in accredited institutions were more likely to make presentations on bilingual education at practioner-oriented meetings. Totally, difference between accredited and non-accredited institutions on the variables of research and development activities were very few--four out of a possibility of 70.

Accredited institutions were more likely to indicate that faculty qualified to teach the multicultural/bilingual education programs was both a contributing and deterring factor in the development of such programs. For non-accredited institutions this factor was more likely to have no influence. Finally, accredited institutions were more likely to indicate that AACTE should provide some service to assist them in the planning, development, and implementation of the multicultural education programs.

GEOGRAPHIC REGION OF INSTITUTION

Of the responding institutions 17.3 percent were from the Northeast; 23.3 percent from the Southeast; 39.5 percent from the Midwest; 10.3 percent from the Southwest; and 8.0 percent from the West. Institutions in the West were more likely to have experiences and activities related to multicultural education than institutions in other regions. Institutions in the West were also more likely to offer courses in women's studies and inservice programs in multicultural/bilingual education than institutions in other regions; institutions in the Southeast were least likely to offer such. There were no significant differences in the way institutions in different regions addressed multicultural education. Institutions in the West, however, were more likely to offer bilingual education as a component in foundations courses, as a component in methodology courses, as a major emphasis in courses, and as a minor or supplementary than institutions in other regions; institutions in the Southeast were least likely to address bilingual

education through the same four provisions.

Institutions in the West and Southwest were more likely to have professional development activities to foster the concept of multicultural and bilingual education than institutions in other regions.

The way in which the multicultural/bilingual education programs were managed was also different in institutions in different geographical regions of the country. The multicultural/bilingual education programs in Western institutions were more likely to be developed by a person responsible for coordinating the multicultural/bilingual education efforts and by cooperative planning with local education agencies; institutions in the Southeast were least likely to develop their programs through these means. Persons responsible for coordinating the multicultural/bilingual education programs in the West were also more likely to control and monitor the programs than in other institutions. In institutions in the Southwest, the financial support for the bilingual education programs was more likely to come from the education unit itself than in institutions in other regions. Institutions in the West and Southwest were more likely to have resources related to multicultural education than institutions in other regions. Institutions in the Southeast were least likely to have a center for ethnic studies/multicultural education/bilingual education and to use ethnic agencies and organizations. Institutions in the Southwest were more likely to use textbooks and consultants.

In the area of research only three significant differences were found. Faculty from institutions in the West were more likely to undertake research activities in multicultural education and produce products in bilingual education than other institutions.

Institutions in the West were more likely to contribute the development and implementation of multicultural/bilingual programs to the availability of federal and state funds than other institutions. Institutions in the Southeast were more likely to feel that the availability of federal funds deterred the development

and implementation of their programs. Finally, institutions in the West were more likely to feel that AACTE should provide services to assist them in planning, developing, and implementing multicultural education programs than institutions in other regions.

POPULATION OF THE CITY OR AREA IN WHICH THE INSTITUTION IN LOCATED

Based on 1970 census figures for the city in which institutions are located, it was determined that 13.7 percent of the responding institutions were located in cities with a population over 500,000; 31.0 percent in cities of 50,000-499,000; 47.8 percent in cities of 2,500 and 49,999; and 7.2 percent in areas of less than 2,500. Institutions in the large urban areas of over 500,000 were more likely to have provisions for activities and experiences related to multicultural education as expressed in question 1 of the survey. Significant differences between institutions were found for seven of the fifteen activities listed. Institutions located in cities of 2,500 to 49,000 were least likely to have the same activities for multicultural education. Institutions in the large urban areas were also more likely to have courses and department/divisions in women's studies and to offer inservice programs in multicultural/bilingual education than other institutions. Institutions in the small town and rural areas were least likely to have such provisions. Institutions in urban (50,000-499,000) and small town (2,500-49,999) were more likely to address multicultural education as the major emphasis in courses than institutions in other areas; institutions in rural areas (under 2,500) were least likely to use this approach. For bilingual education, institutions in small towns were more likely to offer a major or specialization in bilingual education than other institutions while those in rural areas were least likely to offer bilingual education as a major or specialization.

There were no significant differences in the way the concept of multicultural or bilingual education was fostered among faculty members.

In the area of management no significant differences existed in the way

in which multicultural/bilingual education programs were developed or controlled/ monitored. Institutions in small town, however, were more likely to receive the financial support for these programs from the education unit itself than other institutions while those in rural areas were least likely to report the education unit as the source of financial support. Institutions in large urban areas were more likely to have resources for multicultural/bilingual education than other institutions. For six of the eight resources listed in question 15, large institutions were more likely to have them while institutions in small town and rural areas were least likely to have them.

In the area of research and development a significant difference existed for only one variable. Faculty from institutions in urban areas were more likely to undertake research of instructional processes in multicultural education than institutions in other areas; those in rural areas were least likely to undertake such research.

Institutions in large urban areas were more likely to feel that faculty qualified to teach multicultural/bilingual education programs was a contributing factor to the development and implementation of such programs in their institutions. Qualified faculty, on the other hand, was a deterrent to the development and implementation of multicultural/bilingual education programs in institutions located in rural areas. Finally, institutions in rural areas were more likely to feel that AACTE should catalogue information about funding agencies to disseminate as a directory than institutions in other areas.

SIZE OF THE INSTITUTION

For this analysis the size of the institution was determined by the total student population. Institutions in the first quartile had a student population between 327 and 1,366; those in the second quartile from 1,367 to 3,609; those in the third quartile from 3,610 to 9,905; and those in the fourth quartile from 9,906 to 55,000 students.

The largest institutions (those in the fourth quartile) were more likely to

have provisions for activities and experiences in multicultural education than the other institutions. Significant differences existed for eight of the fifteen variables in Question 1. The smallest institutions were least likely to have the same activities. The largest institutions were also more likely to have courses and departments/divisions for ethnic studies and women's studies. They were also more likely to offer inservice programs in multicultural/bilingual education. The smallest institutions were least likely to have courses or departments/divisions in ethnic studies or women's studies or to offer inservice programs in multicultural/bilingual education. The largest institutions were more likely to offer a major or specialization in multicultural education. They were also more likely to address bilingual education as a component in methodology courses, as a major or specialization, and as a minor or supplementary than the other institutions. The smallest institutions were least likely to address multicultural or bilingual education in these ways.

The larger institutions (third and fourth quartile) were more likely to allow for faculty development activities related to multicultural and bilingual education than the smaller institutions. Significant differences existed for six of the sixteen variables in this section.

The largest institutions were more likely to develop their multicultural/bilingual education programs by a person responsible for coordinating them, by each department/program having the prerogative to develop them, and by cooperative planning with local education agencies. The multicultural/bilingual education programs were also more likely to be controlled/monitored by a college or institution-wide curriculum committee and by the person responsible for coordinating the program in large institution than in others. The smaller institutions, first and second quartile, were least likely to develop and control or monitor their programs by these means. The financial support for these programs was more likely to come from the education unit itself in large institutions; it was least likely to come from the education unit

in the smallest institutions. The larger institutions, third and fourth quartile, were more likely to have all of the resources listed in question 15 for multicultural/bilingual education than the smaller institution. The smallest institutions were least likely to have these resources.

In the area of research and development significant differences were found for only two variables. The support for research activities related to multicultural education were more likely to come from the college or university in the largest institutions and least likely to come from the college or university in the smallest institutions. Faculty members of the largest institutions were more likely to make presentations on multicultural education at practitioner-oriented meetings than those at other institutions. Faculty of the smallest institutions were least likely to make such presentations.

No significant differences were found concerning factors which contributed to or deterred the development of multicultural/bilingual education programs. The larger institutions, third and fourth quartile, were more likely to indicate that AACTE should provide services to assist them in planning, developing, and implementing multicultural education programs than the smaller institutions.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY

This report is based on data collected as baseline data from which the progress of multicultural teacher education can be measured. It was possible only be develop descriptive profiles of the 387 institutions responding to the survey. Because less than half of AACTE's member institutions responded to the survey, it is impossible to generalize this data to American teacher education in 1977-78. It would be advisable to conduct a follow-up study of the institutions that did not initially respond to this particular survey. This would allow the researcher to determine if the responding institutions were representative of the general

teacher education institutional population or biased toward the development and implementation of multicultural education in their programs. Such a study would provide a more comprehensive picture of multicultural education as addressed in U.S. teacher education institutions today.

The information collected in this survey does not describe in depth the multicultural education activities being undertaken currently in teacher education. The data provides a baseline against which progress can be measured in research studies. It does not, however, provide specific information about programs from which operationally successful characteristics or components can be drawn. Examination of multicultural education programs now practiced in teacher education needs to be undertaken. Specifically, the following recommendations for further study and research are suggested:

1. What do the components of multicultural education in foundations and methodology courses include?

2. What components of an institution's multicultural education program appear the most successful?

3. What is the focus of successful multicultural education programs? Is it ethnic studies, human relations, anthropology?

4. Are successful multicultural education programs conducted as classes, field experiences, practicum, or other activities?

5. What are the background experiences and training of the faculty who teach or direct multicultural education experiences?

6. Why did teacher education institutions develop and implement multicultural education programs initially? How have the programs changed from the initial planning?

7. What was the implementation process utilized by institutions with programs that permeate the curriculum? with program components that have proven successful?

8. Are certain components for multicultural education programs more successful in urban than rural areas, etc.? in monocultural vs multicultural or culturally diverse population areas?

9. Are institutions located in states with legislation and certification requirements for multicultural education providing for multicultural education in their teacher education programs differently than institutions in states without such provisions?

The data presented in this report should serve as a springboard for further research. The nine recommendations suggested above only examine the programmatic activities within the curricula of teacher education. The impact of multicultural education programs and experiences on the preservice or inservice teacher or education administrator has yet to be examined. Research related to multicultural education needs to be identified, examined and categorized to be used effectively in teacher education.

AACTE hopes that this baseline study will serve as the framework for additional research in this area. AACTE also hopes that this initial identification of multicultural education programs will assist in the further identification and development of components that might be used successfully by other insitutions in the planning, developing, and implementing of their own programs in this area.

APPENDIX A

CORRESPONDENCE RELATED TO

"SURVEY OF MULTICULTURAL EDUCATION IN TEACHER EDUCATION"

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES FOR TEACHER EDUCATION
One Dupont Circle, Washington, D.C. 20036 (202) 293-2450

July 1, 1977

Dear Chief Institutional Representative:

At its May, 1977 meeting, the NCATE Council adopted a revised set of "Standards for Accreditation of Teacher Education" which will apply as of January 1, 1979. The revised standards include a single standard on multicultural education, which is defined in national and international terms, subsumed under the section related to curriculum. The standards addressing faculty, students, resources, and planning also include references to multicultural education.

In an effort to provide assistance to member colleges and universities the AACTE Commission on Multicultural Education is planning a series of leadership training institutes this fall for faculty and administrators. In addition AACTE plans to conduct a national survey in order to (a) identify personnel and program resources for multicultural education; (b) facilitate the machinery for interchange of ideas among the AACTE constituency; (c) develop long range policies and recommendations concerning multicultural education in teacher education; and (d) encourage, assist, and to the extent possible, support developmental efforts related to multicultural goals for teacher education.

The AACTE requests your cooperation in gathering information about multicultural activities in your institution. A "Survey of Multicultural Education in Teacher Education" will be mailed to all AACTE member institutions in September, 1977, to collect such data. In order to facilitate the process of data collection, could you designate an individual within the department, school, or college of education who would have responsibility for completing this questionnaire? This individual should be someone who is familiar with the multicultural, ethnic studies and/or bilingual education at your institution. Please indicate the designated respondent on the enclosed postcard and return it to AACTE by July 15, 1977. Further correspondence concerning the survey will then be directed to that person.

This survey is designed to gather and analyze national baseline data regarding current and planned efforts in multicultural education by teacher education institutions.

This information will be used to:

(1) compile a State of the Art report on multicultural education as practiced in American teacher education;
(2) compile a directory of multicultural education programs in AACTE member institutions; and
(3) analyze the way multicultural education is addressed in teacher education.

The final report, which will be available early in 1978, will also include an analysis of state departments of education regulations and professional association positions related to multicultural education.

Your assistance in completing this initial inquiry is sincerely appreciated. If you have questions, please contact Donna Gollnick at AACTE, (202) 293-2450.

Sincerely yours,

Frank H. Klassen
Director, Multicultural Education
Associate Director, AACTE

FHK/pf

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES FOR TEACHER EDUCATION
One Dupont Circle, Washington, D.C. 20036 (202) 293-2450

September 19, 1977

Dear Respondent:

The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education is undertaking a national survey of the multicultural dimension of American teacher education. As the designated respondent of your institution, you are invited to respond to the enclosed questionnaire, "Survey of Multicultural Education in Teacher Education." Please return the questionnaire in the self-addressed, enclosed envelope to AACTE by October 28, 1977.

This survey is prompted first by the long term commitment of AACTE, through its Commission on Multicultural Education, to assist colleges and universities in the preparation of education personnel for a culturally pluralistic and ethnically diverse society. Second, recent changes in the Accreditation Standards of the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) require greater institutional focus on multicultural education in all phases of its teacher education program. It is imperative therefore, that the national progress and the state of the art in this field be analyzed and disseminated for the benefit of teacher educators.

The findings of this survey will be incorporated in a report which will include state regulations and guidelines on multicultural/bilingual education as well. The report, to be disseminated in early 1978, will be of considerable value to institutions whose programs and organization reflect a multicultural perspective as well as to those who are planning to do so. In addition, these findings will be utilized in a leadership training institute to be conducted later this year. Your response will make an important contribution to this national effort to improve the quality of teacher education.

The Survey Instrument

This instrument is designed to ascertain how educators are being prepared to work in multicultural education settings. The information collected from this survey will be used in the compilation of a "State of the Scene" Report and in the preparation of leadership training institutes for teacher educators.

The instrument asks for information about the institution as well as the education unit. Each question identifies the unit for which the information is being requested.

Information is requested in six different areas related to multicultural/bilingual bicultural education as follows.

1) Programmatic activities
2) Faculty in the education unit
3) Management of programs

4) Students in the education unit
5) Research and development activities
6) General information.

If your education unit does not have multicultural/bilingual-bicultural programs, there are parts of the questionnaire that you should not complete. Bold letters throughout the questionnaire indicate these directions.

Your assistance in completing this survey is sincerely appreciated. If you have questions concerning this, please contact Donna Gollnick at AACTE, (202) 293-2450.

Sincerely yours,

Frank H. Klassen
Director, Multicultural Education
Associate Director, AACTE

Enc
FHK/zt

APPENDIX B

SURVEY OF MULTICULTURAL EDUCATION IN TEACHER EDUCATION

Survey of Multicultural Education in Teacher Education

Fall 1977

Conducted by

The Commission on Multicultural Education of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education

Edward C. Pomeroy, Executive Director
Tomas Arciniega, Commission Chairman
Frank Klassen, Associate Director

One Dupont Circle
Washington, D.C. 20036
202-293-2450

PURPOSE OF SURVEY

This survey is being conducted by AACTE's Commission on Multicultural Education to determine the present state of multicultural education, including bilingual education, as practiced in teacher education in the United States.

DIRECTIONS FOR COMPLETING THE QUESTIONNAIRE

Pretesting has indicated that it takes about 90 minutes to complete the questionnaire. The respondent may call Donna Gollnick at 202-293-2450 to obtain additional information or clarification.

Please return the questionnaire in the enclosed self-addressed envelope by *October 30* to AACTE.

STATEMENT OF CONFIDENTIALITY

The AACTE has established the following policy guidelines for collection, storage and dissemination of data and for treatment of information derived from that data:

1) The Association's information systems activities are operated under the general control of the Board of Directors.
2) The Association strives to serve the information needs of all segments of the membership with equal interest and vigor.
3) The Association's computer-assisted information systems activities are treated with the same concern as are other, existing data files.
4) The processes of data analysis and dissemination are conducted in such a way that records of individual institutions are not identifiable. Aggregates of data are reported on bases such as institution type, size, nature and type of programs, state, geographic region and nationally. An individual institution's data is made available only to that institution.
5) In the processes of data collection and dissemination, the primary link between the information system and an AACTE member institution is the position of AACTE Chief Institutional Representative.
6) The information system is primarily for the use of AACTE member institutions and of the Association. Access by other legitimate, interested agencies to system products and services is controlled by the Board of Directors so that such access is clearly in the interest of improving teacher education.

DEFINITION OF TERMS USED IN THIS QUESTIONNAIRE

The terms that follow are used throughout the questionnaire. The respondent should refer to these definitions as necessary.

Multicultural Education is an educational concept which values the culturally pluralistic nature of the United States and thus the community and student population that schools serve.

> Multicultural education is preparation for the social, political, and economic realities that individuals experience in culturally diverse and complex human encounters. These realities have both national and international dimensions. This preparation provides a process by which an individual develops competencies for perceiving, believing, evaluating, and behaving in differential cultural settings. Thus, multicultural education is viewed as an intervention and on-going assessment process to help institutions and individuals become more responsive to the human condition, individual cultural integrity, and cultural pluralism in society.*

Multicultural teacher education provides teachers with the competencies required to teach from a multicultural perspective. It implies that teachers be able to provide programs where all students are helped to understand that being different connotes neither superiority nor inferiority and programs where students of various social and ethnic backgrounds may learn freely from one another.

Bilingual-Bicultural Education is recognized as an integral part of the multicultural education concept. It is defined separately for this survey, however, because it is distinguished by the dimension of two languages as well as cultural diversity. Bilingual-bicultural education utilizes both English and the native languages of students in the school program and also provides experiences for learning about the cultural heritage of the non-English speaking ethnic group. These programs may range from transitional programs aimed at having students learning English after several years to a multilingual/multicultural program in which students learn to function totally in two languages and cultures.

Bilingual-bicultural teacher education provides teachers with the competencies required to teach in schools with bilingual student populations. It also implies that teachers recognize, accept and value the cultural and language differences of students in their instructional and personal communications with students and the community.

Education Unit is the organizational structure which is responsible for functions related to Education as an academic discipline including undergraduate teacher preparation, all departments/divisions/areas within that organizational structure, educational research and professional service. The education unit often takes the form of a professional school, college or academic division or department.

Institution is the entire complex of departments, professional schools and other organizational units that are present on the campus.

SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIALS

We would appreciate your supplementing your response in this questionnaire with any materials (statements of purpose, course descriptions, syllabi, curriculum guides, pamphlets, etc.) describing the multicultural education programs currently offered or planned. Please send documents separately to the Ethnic Heritage Center, AACTE, Suite 610, One Dupont Circle, Washington, D.C. 20036.

For purposes of follow-up and/or amplification of your institution's response, AACTE would like the following information about the individual who assumed major responsibility for preparing this report:

NAME OF PRINCIPAL RESPONDENT _____

TITLE _____

INSTITUTION _____

TELEPHONE _____ ZIP CODE _____

*This definition is taken from the preamble to Standard 2.1.1 of the 1977 *Standards for the Accreditation of Teacher Education*.

SECTION A: PROGRAMS

1. Please indicate on the left hand side of the following chart which activities your *education unit* has provisions for during the fall, 1977 session. On the right hand side, please indicate your assessment of the educational desirability for such activities.

PROVISIONS		ACTIVITIES	EDUCATIONAL DESIRABILITY					
Yes	No		Highly Desirable					Not Desirable
( )	( )	A student teaching experience in a school with students who are racially/ethnically different from the student teachers	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
( )	( )	Study of values clarification	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
( )	( )	Study of the dynamics of diverse cultures and the implications for developing appropriate teaching strategies.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
( )	( )	Study of linguistic variations and the implications for developing appropriate teaching strategies.	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
( )	( )	Study of diverse learning styles related to ethnic/cultural difference and the implications for developing appropriate teaching strategies	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
( )	( )	Study of racism	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
( )	( )	Study of sexism	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
( )	( )	Study of intergroup communications and classroom dynamics	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
( )	( )	Study of cultures and ethnicity of those groups within the geographical region served by the education unit	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
( )	( )	Study of cultural competencies that can be transferred from one cultural or multicultural setting to another	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
( )	( )	Study of specific ethnic groups within the U.S. (i.e., Afro American Studies, Mexican-American Studies)	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
( )	( )	Study of foreign cultures	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
( )	( )	Study of socioeconomics	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
( )	( )	Experiences which prepare education personnel to work more effectively with minority students	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
( )	( )	Experiences which prepare education personnel to teach content from a multicultural perspective	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )

2. Does your *institution* offer any courses or have any departments/divisions related to U.S. ethnic groups (e.g., Black Studies, Native American Studies)?

( ) Yes ( ) No

If you answered YES, please complete parts a and b. If you answered NO, skip to Question 3.

a. Please indicate the ethnic focus of these programs and whether they are courses or an institutional department/division.

DEPARTMENT/ DIVISION	COURSES	
( )	( )	Afro Americans
( )	( )	American Indians
( )	( )	Appalachians
( )	( )	Asian Americans
( )	( )	Chinese Americans
( )	( )	Eskimos
( )	( )	Filipino Americans
( )	( )	French Americans
( )	( )	Greek Americans
( )	( )	Irish Americans
( )	( )	Italian Americans
( )	( )	Japanese Americans
( )	( )	Jewish Americans
( )	( )	Mexican Americans
( )	( )	Polish Americans
( )	( )	Portuguese Americans
( )	( )	Puerto Ricans
( )	( )	Russian Americans
		Other (please specify)
( )	( )	_____
( )	( )	_____

b. Are any of these courses required for completion of an education degree program?

Required for Degree Program ( ) Yes ( ) No
Required for Non-Degree Program (e.g. Inservice Program) ( ) Yes ( ) No

3. Does your *institution* offer any courses or have a department/division related to women's studies?

Courses ( ) Yes ( ) No
Department/Division ( ) Yes ( ) No

If you answered YES to either of the above, please indicate whether any of these courses are required for completion of an education degree program or any other program.

a. Required for Degree Program ( ) Yes ( ) No
Required for Non-Degree Program ( ) Yes ( ) No

4. Does your *education unit* offer inservice programs in multicultural/bilingual-bicultural education either as an independent unit or in cooperation with a local education agency, teacher center or other agency?

( ) Yes ( ) No

If you answered YES to the above, please indicate the type of program and the target language(s) and/or ethnic populations.

a. _____

_____

_____

_____

5. Please indicate how multicultural/bilingual-bicultural education is being addressed within your *education unit* during the fall, 1977 session. Check all that apply.

	MULTICULTURAL	BILINGUAL-BICULTURAL
No Provisions	( )	( )
Component in Foundations Course(s)	( )	( )
Component in Methodology Course(s)	( )	( )
Major Emphasis in Course(s)	( )	( )
Major or Specialization Offered	( )	( )
Minor or Supplementary Offered	( )	( )
Department/Division	( )	( )
Other (please specify)		
_____	( )	( )
_____	( )	( )

If you marked "No Provisions," in both columns, skip to Question 8.

6. If the *education unit* offers multicultural/bilingual-bicultural education as either a **component or major emphasis of courses**, please list the course numbers of those courses according to the following levels. *IF POSSIBLE, PLEASE SUPPLEMENT THIS WITH A COLLEGE CATALOG OR BULLETIN THAT DESCRIBES THESE COURSES.*

	MULTICULTURAL	BILINGUAL-BICULTURAL
Undergraduate		
Dual Level		
Graduate		
Other		

a. Please indicate whether any of these courses are required for completion of an education degree program or any other program.

Required for Degree Program ( ) Yes ( ) No
Required for Non-Degree Program ( ) Yes ( ) No

b. If you listed any courses in the column for bilingual-bicultural education, please indicate the target languages for those courses. Check all that apply.

( ) Arabic	( ) French	( ) Nez Perce
( ) Cantonese	( ) German	( ) Polish
( ) Chaldean	( ) Italian	( ) Portuguese
( ) Cherokee	( ) Japanese	( ) Spanish
( ) Chinese	( ) Korean	Other (please specify)
( ) Choctaw	( ) Krowte	
( ) Cheyenne	( ) Lakota	( ) _____
( ) Filipino	( ) Navajo	( ) _____

7. Please indicate the total number of students enrolled in multicultural/bilingual education courses or programs at all different degree levels for the fall 1977 session.

	MULTICULTURAL			BILINGUAL-BICULTURAL		
	Major	Minor	Courses	Major	Minor	Courses
Bachelor						
Post Bachelor (Fifth Year)						
Master						
Specialist						
Doctor						
Other (please specify)						

SECTION B: FACUL[illegible]

Please report the sex and ethnic background of faculty members in your *education unit* for the fall, 1977 session. The following steps will guide you through the completion of this task.

Step 1: This question requests a breakdown by sex and ethnic background of the full-time, split-time, and part-time education unit faculty defined as follows:

FULL-TIME EDUCATION FACULTY: Persons carrying a full-time load, all of whose activities are devoted to operations of the education unit.

SPLIT-TIME EDUCATION FACULTY: Full-time faculty for whom only a portion of their activities are devoted to activities operated by the education unit. (e.g., an English professor who teaches one methods course)

PART-TIME EDUCATION FACULTY: Faculty carrying less than a full-time load in the education unit who are not full-time employees of the institution.

You may wish to consult your Office of Institutional Research which submits a report of faculty sex and ethnicity to the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC): EEOC "Higher Education Status Report" Form GAO B-182540.

Step 2: If your institution has adopted a formal policy that information about the composition of the faculty by sex and ethnic background is not for public release, please check the space below and skip to Question 9.

( ) This information is not for public release

Step 3: Please provide the information requested in the following table.

	FULL-TIME	SPLIT-TIME	PART-TIME
WHITE AMERICAN (not of Hispanic Origin) Male			
Female			
BLACK AMERICAN (not of Hispanic Origin) Male			
Female			
HISPANIC Male			
Female			
ASIAN OR PACIFIC ISLANDER Male			
Female			
AMERICAN INDIAN OR ALASKAN NATIVE Male			
Female			
OTHER (not identified above) Male			
Female			

9. Please indicate the ways in which the concept of multicultural/bilingual-bicultural education have been fostered among faculty members in your *education unit*. Check all that apply.

	MULTICULTURAL	BILINGUAL-BICULTURAL
Professional Association Meetings	( )	( )
Seminars/symposiums	( )	( )
Inservice training for faculty	( )	( )
Cross-cultural field experiences	( )	( )
Sabbatical(s) for projects related to multicultural/bilingual-bicultural education	( )	( )
Faculty research grants for multicultural/bilingual-bicultural education projects	( )	( )
Faculty is on their own with respect to multicultural/bilingual-bicultural education	( )	( )
Other (please specify)		
_____	( )	( )
_____	( )	( )

If your education unit does not have provisions for multicultural/bilingual-bicultural education, skip to Question 16.

10. In multicultural/bilingual-bicultural education courses, faculty members are often from schools, colleges, or departments within the university other than education. Please indicate what disciplines or areas of study the faculty members from other than education represent. Check all that apply.

( ) Afro American Studies
( ) Agriculture
( ) American Studies
( ) American Indian Studies
( ) Anthropology
( ) Art
( ) Asian Studies
( ) Business
( ) Economics
( ) English
( ) Foreign Language
( ) History
( ) Home Economics
( ) International Affairs
( ) Law
( ) Mathematics
( ) Mexican American Studies
( ) Philosophy
( ) Music
( ) Physical Education
( ) Physical Science
( ) Political Science
( ) Psychology
( ) Sociology
( ) Theatre Arts/Drama
Other (please specify)
( ) _____
( ) _____

193

11. Within your *education unit*, please indicate the program areas that full-time and part-time faculty members teaching multicultural/bilingual-bicultural courses represent. Check all that apply.

( ) Early Childhood Education
( ) Elementary Education
( ) Jr. High/Middle School Education
( ) Secondary Education
( ) Jr/Community College Education
( ) Higher Education
( ) Adult/Continuing Education
( ) Administration
( ) Audio-Visual Education
( ) Curriculum and Instruction
( ) Educational Psychology
( ) Guidance and Counseling
( ) Ed Test, Msmt, & Evaluation
( ) International & Comparative
( ) Research and Statistics
( ) School Psychology
( ) Social Found/Hist & Phil
( ) Special Education
( ) Student Personnel Admin
( ) Urban Education
( ) Agricultural Education
( ) Art Education
( ) Business Education
( ) Distributive Education
( ) English Education
( ) Foreign Language Education
( ) Home Economics Education
( ) Industrial Arts Education
( ) Language Arts/Reading
( ) Mathematics Education
( ) Music Education
( ) Physical Education/Health
( ) Science Education
( ) Social Studies Education
( ) Speech/Hearing
( ) Technical/Industrial Education
( ) Vocational Education
( ) Vocational Rehabilitation
Other (please specify)

_____

_____

12. If there are courses related to multicultural/bilingual-bicultural education within your *education unit*, please report the sex and ethnic background of the faculty members teaching such courses during the fall, 1977 session. Please indicate whether these faculty members are full-time, split-time, or part-time in your education unit.

	MULTICULTURAL			BILINGUAL-BICULTURAL		
	Full-Time	Split-Time	Part-Time	Full-Time	Split-Time	Part-Time
BLACK AMERICAN (not of Hispanic Origin) Male						
Female						
HISPANIC Male						
Female						
ASIAN OR PACIFIC ISLANDER Male						
Female						
WHITE AMERICAN (Not of Hispanic Origin) Male						
Female						
AMERICAN INDIAN OR ALASKAN NATIVE Male						
Female						

SECTION C: MANAGEMENT

13. Please indicate the ways in which the multicultural/bilingual-bicultural education activities within your *education unit* are developed and controlled/monitored. Check all that apply.

	DEVELOPED	CONTROLLED/ MONITORED
By a college or institution-wide curriculum committee	( )	( )
By a person responsible for directing/coordinating the multicultural/bilingual efforts. PLEASE GIVE NAME AND ADDRESS OF THIS PERSON.	( )	( )
_____		
_____		
_____		
By each department/program within the education unit having the prerogative to develop, control, and monitor its own multicultural programs	( )	( )
By a consortium with other colleges, school districts, and other agencies. Please indicate the type of consortium	( )	( )
_____		
_____		
_____		
By cooperative planning with local education agencies	( )	( )
By cooperative planning with teacher organizations	( )	( )
Other (please specify)		
_____	( )	( )
_____	( )	( )

14. Please indicate from where the financial support for multicultural/bilingual-bicultural programs comes. Check all that apply.

	MULTICULTURAL	BILINGUAL-BICULTURAL
Education Unit	( )	( )
Other University Sources	( )	( )
U.S.O.E.	( )	( )
Other Federal Funds	( )	( )
State Departments of Education	( )	( )
Private Foundations	( )	( )
Other (please specify)		
_____	( )	( )
_____	( )	( )

15. Please indicate the following resources that are utilized by faculty and/or students in the implementation of multicultural/bilingual-bicultural programs.

( ) Center for Ethnic Studies/Multicultural Education/Bilingual-Bicultural Education
( ) Textbooks
( ) Ethnic agencies/organizations
( ) Consultants who are not part of the university faculty
( ) Cooperative programs with public or private schools that have a multicultural student population
( ) Cooperative programs with public or private schools that have a student population with different ethnic backgrounds than the majority of students in the teacher education program
( ) Student experiences in cultural settings different than that of the teacher education student
( ) Community-based program as some phase of the student's work

SECTION D: STUDENTS

16. Please report the sex and ethnic background of students at your *institution* and in your *education unit* for the fall, 1977 session. The following steps will guide you through the completion of this task.

Step 1: You may use any of the methods listed below; however, please identify the methods used by checking all appropriate boxes.

( ) Figures reported represent education majors and do not include persons preparing to be teachers who are majoring outside the education unit

( ) Figures reported represent all persons taking courses in the education unit, both majors and non-majors

( ) Figures reported are based on headcounts

( ) Figures reported are based on full-time equivalency (FTE)

( ) Other (please specify) _____

_____

You may wish to consult your Office of Institutional Research or the Registrar where total institutional figures should be available from their Office of Civil Rights report (Form OCR "Biennial Report").

Step 2: Please complete the following table using the information which you gathered in Step 1.

	TOTAL INSTITUTION	UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION	GRADUATE EDUCATION
WHITE AMERICAN (not of Hispanic origin) Male			
Female			
BLACK AMERICAN (not of Hispanic origin) Male			
Female			
HISPANIC Male			
Female			
ASIAN OR PACIFIC ISLANDER Male			
Female			
AMERICAN INDIAN OR ALASKAN NATIVE Male			
Female			
OTHER (not specified above) Male			
Female			

17. If your institution or *education unit* maintains data about the employment of the teacher education graduates, please indicate the percentage of those graduates working in the following education situations.

Inner City Schools _____%

Bilingual Classrooms/Schools _____%

American Indian Reservations _____%

Other (please specify)

_____ _____%

_____ _____%

SECTION E: RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

18. For research activities related to multicultural/bilingual education, please indicate the types of activities undertaken in your *education unit*. Check all that apply.

	MULTICULTURAL	BILINGUAL-BICULTURAL
Master Theses	( )	( )
Doctoral Dissertations	( )	( )
Faculty Projects	( )	( )
Sponsored Research	( )	( )
Special Institutes	( )	( )
Other (please specify)		
_____	( )	( )
_____	( )	( )

If you checked any of the above, please answer parts a and b. If you checked none of the above, please skip to Question 19.

a. Please indicate the nature of the multicultural/bilingual research activities undertaken in your education unit and whether those activities are undertaken by graduate students or faculty members. Check all that apply.

	MULTICULTURAL		BILINGUAL-BICULTURAL	
	Faculty	Graduate Student	Faculty	Graduate Student
Ethnographic Research	( )	( )	( )	( )
Research on acculturation/ assimilation/cultural pluralism	( )	( )	( )	( )
Research on social/cultural processes	( )	( )	( )	( )
Research of instructional processes	( )	( )	( )	( )
Research on interethnic attitudes	( )	( )	( )	( )
Reseach on culturally-biased tests and other measurement instruments influenced by cultural differences	( )	( )	( )	( )
Other (please specify)				
_____	( )	( )	( )	( )
_____	( )	( )	( )	( )

b. For research activities related to multicultural/bilingual-bicultural education, please indicate how these activities are supported. Check all that apply.

	MULTICULTURAL	BILINGUAL-BICULTURAL
College or University	( )	( )
U.S. Office of Education	( )	( )
National Institute of Education	( )	( )
State Department of Education	( )	( )
Local Education Association	( )	( )
Private Foundations	( )	( )
Other (please specify)		
_____	( )	( )
_____	( )	( )

WE REQUEST THAT YOU SUPPLEMENT THIS WITH DESCRIPTIONS OF THE SPECIFIC RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS WHEN POSSIBLE.

19. Please indicate the types of multicultural/bilingual-bicultural products produced by members of your *education unit*.

	MULTICULTURAL	BILINGUAL-BICULTURAL
Publications in practitioner-oriented journals (e.g., *Today's Education, Phi Delta Kappan*)	( )	( )
Presentations at practitioner-oriented meetings	( )	( )
Publications in research-oriented journals (e.g., *American Educational Research Journal*)	( )	( )
Presentations at research-oriented meetings	( )	( )
Publications in books	( )	( )
Educational products for local or regional dissemination	( )	( )
Educational products for national dissemination	( )	( )
Other (please specify)	( )	( )
_____	( )	( )
_____	( )	( )

WE REQUEST THAT YOU SUPPLEMENT THIS SECTION WITH ANY MATERIALS (BIBLIOGRAPHIC REFERENCES, ARTICLES, PUBLICATIONS, ABSTRACTS) THAT WOULD INDICATE THE INVOLVEMENT OF THE FACULTY IN MULTICULTURAL OR BILINGUAL-BICULTURAL ACTIVITIES.

SECTION F: GENERAL

20. How much, in your opinion, have the following factors contributed to or deterred the present and future planning, development, and implementation of multicultural/bilingual-bicultural programs in your *education unit*? Please check the space that best describes your opinion for each factor.

	MAJOR CONTRIBUTION		NO INFLUENCE		MAJOR DETERRENT
Faculty qualified to teach multicultural/bilingual-bicultural education	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
Availability of university funds	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
Availability of federal funds	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
Availability of state funds	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
State education agency guidelines and/or regulations related to multicultural/bilingual education	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
State legislation related to multicultural/bilingual education	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
Federal legislation related to multicultural/bilingual education	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
Encouragement of professional associations	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
University/college administration	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
Availability of curriculum materials for college students	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
Various ethnic groups	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
Teacher Organizations	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
Desegregation of school district(s) near the university or college	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
Other (please specify)					
_____	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
_____	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )

21. Please indicate which of the following kinds of services that you would like to see AACTE provide to assist the *education unit* in planning, developing, and implementing multicultural education programs.

( ) Publish a journal or bulletin that informs teacher educators of new ideas, approaches, or materials in multicultural education
( ) Stimulate research and analysis on various aspects of multicultural education through the convening of task forces
( ) Provide consultation on development of proposals and research designs for submission to federal agencies
( ) Catalogue information about funding agencies to disseminate as a directory
( ) Facilitate the dissemination of information about operationally and programmatically successful multicultural programs
( ) Maintain a consultative service on multicultural teacher education that can match expertise to needs at all levels
( ) Convene national or regional meetings on multicultural education
( ) Provide a clearinghouse for informational, research and analytical studies of multicultural education
( ) Conduct research and analytical studies on multicultural education
( ) Provide information about federal and state legislation

( ) Other (please specify) _____

22. In your opinion, what is the future of multicultural and/or bilingual-bicultural education in your *education unit*? Please write on the back if additional space is needed.

WE REQUEST THAT YOU SUPPLEMENT THIS SURVEY WITH THE COLLEGE CATALOG, COURSE DESCRIPTIONS, SYLLABI, CURRICULUM GUIDES, ETC. THAT WOULD ASSIST IN UNDERSTANDING THE MULTICULTURAL/BILINGUAL-BICULTURAL ACTIVITIES UNDERTAKEN IN YOUR EDUCATION UNIT.